Chas. Chillingworth 10 Nov 1654

Mr. *Chillingworth's* Book

CALLED THE

Religion of Protestants

A SAFE WAY TO

SALVATION,

Made more generally useful by omitting Personal Contests, but inserting whatsoever concerns the common Cause of *Protestants*, or defends the Church of *England*.

WITH

An ADDITION of some genuine Pieces of Mr. *Chillingworth's* never before Printed.

Isaac. Casaub. in Ep. ad Card. *Perron.* Reg. *Jac.* nomine scripta.

Rex arbitratur rerum absolutè necessariarum ad salutem non magnum esse numerum. Quare existimat ejus Majestas, nullam ad ineundem concordiam breviorem viam fore, quàm si diligenter separentur necessaria à non necessariis, & ut de necessariis conveniat, omnis opera insumatur: in non necessariis libertati Christianæ locus detur, Simpliciter necessaria Rex appellat, quæ vel expresse verbum Dei præcipit credenda faciendave, vel ex verbo Dei necessariâ consequentiâ vetus Ecclesia elicuit. — Si ad decidendas hodiernas Controversias hæc distinctio adhiberetur, & jus divinum à positivo seu Ecclesiastico candidè separaretur; non videtur de iis quæ sunt absolutè necessaria, inter pios & moderatos viros, longa aut acris contentio futura. Nam & pauca illa sunt, ut modò dicebamus, & fere ex æquo omnibus probantur, qui se Christianos dici postulant. Atque istam distinctionem Serenissi. Rex tanti putat esse momenti ad minuendas Controversias, quæ hodie Ecclesiam Dei tantopere exercent, ut omnium pacis studiosorum judicet officium esse, diligentissimè hanc explicare, docere, urgere.

London, Printed for *R. Chiswell*, at the Rose and Crown in S. *Pauls* Church-yard, *C. Harper*, at the Flower de-Luce in *Fleetstreet*, *W. Crook*, at the Green-Dragon without *Temple-Bar*, and *J. Adamson* at the Angel in S. *Paul's* Church-yard. 1687.

Chillingworth died A.D. 1644.

Do Not Circulate

I *Hope I ſhall incur no blame from thoſe who deſervedly value this Excellent* BOOK *of Mr.* Chillingworth, *for having made it of a leſſer bulk and an eaſier purchaſe than before, after I have told them my way of proceeding herein: I have not Epitomized it in the uſual way, by contracting any where his ſenſe, and giving it more briefly in words of my own; which would have been indeed an injury to him, who knew ſo well how to expreſs his own ſenſe fully and perſpicuouſly beyond moſt men, without any redundancy of ſtyle; but by paring off and leaving out ſome parts of it, which I thought might be well ſpared, and make the Reading of his Book more pleaſant, as well as more generally uſeful, when his defence of the Proteſtant Doctrins and the cauſe of the Reformation lay more cloſely together, not being interrupted with ſo many pages ſpent to juſtifie Dr.* Potter *in the perſonal contèſts betwixt him and his adverſary; or in detecting the ſophiſtry, frauds and falſities of the Jeſuit, where the matter was not of common concern. But where I thought it was, I have been ſcrupulouſly careful to omit nothing: ſo far from it, that I am apt upon a review to think, that the pleaſure of reading his admirable Confutation, has bribed me to inſert more than was needful, in purſuance of my firſt deſign.*

The reaſon why the Jeſuits Book which Mr. Chillingworth *anſwers is not here reprinted, was partly becauſe it is too tedious and wordy, abounding in impertinent cavils, and affecting to fetch a great compaſs to amuſe and loſe the*

Reader before he comes to the point in Queſtion, which he ſcarce ever attempts cloſely to prove; and chiefly becauſe Mr. Chillingworth *has commonly all along ſet down in a different Character, as much of his words, as was needful to let the Reader ſee, what it is he makes a Reply to, and where I found any omiſſion of this kind, I have tranſcribed out of the Jeſuits Book ſuch paſſages and citations, as might give further light to it: beſides, that every one who has a mind, or any doubt remaining about this matter, may eaſily conſult the Folio Edition & ſatisfie himſelf.*

I have added a large Table of Contents *at the end which was wanting before, whereby the Reader may find any Argument or head of Diſcourſe therein contained, with little or no trouble; which Table will ſerve any Edition of the Book, becauſe the numbers after the Chapter refer to the diviſions of the Chapters at the ſide, not to the Pages at the top.*

As for the Additional pieces that follow the Book, and were never before printed, he that reads them will find by the clearneſs of expreſſion, the cloſe way of arguing and ſtrength of reaſoning, ſufficient to convince him that they are not ſpurious, but the genuine productions of this great Man; but yet for his further ſatisfaction he may know, that the Manuſcript out of which moſt of them were faithfully tranſcribed, is an Original of Mr. Chillingworths *own handwriting, and now in the cuſtody of the Reverend Dr.* Tenniſon, *to whom he is beholden for their preſent Publication.*

Farewel.

TO

TO THE

Moſt High and Mighty PRINCE,

CHARLES

BY THE GRACE OF GOD,

KING of Great *Brittain*, *France* and *Ireland*, Defender of the Faith, *&c.*

May it pleaſe Your moſt Excellent Majeſty,

I Preſent, with all humility to Your moſt ſacred Hands, a Defence of that Cauſe which is and ought to be infinitely dearer to you, than all the world: Not doubting but upon this Dedication I ſhall be cenſured for a double boldneſs; both for undertaking ſo great a Work, ſo far beyond my weak abilities, and again, for preſenting it to ſuch a Patron, whoſe judgment I ought to fear more than any Adverſary. But for the firſt, it is a ſatisfaction to my ſelf, and may be to others, that I was not drawn to it out of any vain opinion of my ſelf, (whoſe perſonal defects are the only thing which I preſume to know,) but undertook it in obedience to Him, who ſaid, *Tu Converſus confirma fratres*, not to S. *Peter* only but to all men: being encouraged alſo to it by the goodneſs of the Cauſe, which is able to make a weak man ſtrong. To the belief hereof I was not led partially or by chance, as many are, by the prejudice and prepoſſeſſion of their Country, Education and ſuch like inducements, which if they lead to truth in one place, perhaps lead to error in a hundred; but having with the greateſt equality and indifferency, made enquiry and ſearch into the grounds on both ſides, I was willing to impart to

others

others that ſatisfaction which was given to my ſelf. For my inſcribing to it your Majeſties ſacred Name, I ſhould labour much in my excuſe of it from high preſumption, had it not ſome appearance of Title to your Majeſties Patronage and protection as being a Defence of that Book, which by ſpecial Order from Your Majeſty was written ſome years ſince chiefly for the general good, but peradventure not without ſome aim at the recovery of One of your meaneſt Subjects from a dangerous deviation, and ſo due unto your Majeſty, as the fruit of your own High humility and moſt Royal Charity. Beſides, it is in a manner nothing elſe, but a purſuance of, and a ſuperſtruction upon that bleſſed Doctrin, wherewith I have adorn'd and arm'd the Frontiſpiece of my Book, which was ſo earneſtly recommended by your Royal Father of happy memory, to all the lovers of Truth and Peace, that is to all that were like himſelf, as the only hopeful means of healing the breaches of Chriſtendom, whereof the Enemy of ſouls makes ſuch peſtilent advantage. The luſtre of this bleſſed Doctrin I have here endeavoured to uncloud and unveil, and to free it from thoſe miſts and fumes which have been rais'd to obſcure it, by that Order, which envenoms even poiſon it ſelf, and makes the *Roman* Religion much more malignant and turbulent than otherwiſe it would be; whoſe very Rule and Doctrin, obliges them to make all men, as much as lies in them, ſubjects unto Kings, and ſervants unto Chriſt, no farther than it ſhall pleaſe the Pope. So that whether Your Majeſty be conſidered, either as a pious Son towards your Royal Father K. *James*, or as a tender hearted and compaſſionate Son towards your diſtreſſed Mother, the Catholick Church, or as a King of your Subjects, or as a Servant unto Chriſt, this work, (to which I can give no other commendation, but that it was intended to do you ſervice in all theſe capacities,) may pretend not unreaſonably to your Gracious acceptance.

ceptance. Laſtly being a Defence of that whole Church and Religion you profeſs, it could not be ſo proper to any Patron as to the great Defender of it; which ſtile Your Majeſty hath ever ſo exactly made good, both in ſecuring it from all dangers, and in vindicating it (by the well ordering and rectifying this Church) from all the foul aſperſions both of Domeſtick and Forein enemies, of which they can have no ground, but their own malice and want of Charity. But it's an argument of a deſpairing and loſt cauſe to ſupport it ſelf with theſe impetuous outcries and clamors, the faint refuges of thoſe that want better arguments; like that Stoick in *Lucian* that cried Ω κατάρατον, *O damn'd villain*, when he could ſay nothing elſe. Neither is it credible the wiſer ſort of them ſhould believe this their own horrid aſſertion, That a God of goodneſs ſhould damn to eternal torments, thoſe that love him and love truth, for errors which they fall into through humane frailty! But this they muſt ſay, otherwiſe their only great argument from their damning us, and our not being ſo peremptory in damning them, becauſe we hope unaffected Ignorance may excuſe them, would be loſt: and therefore they are engaged to act on this Tragical part, only to fright the ſimple and ignorant, as we do little children by telling them that bites, which we would not have them meddle with. And truly that herein they do but act a part, and know themſelves to do ſo, and deal with us here as they do with the King of *Spain* at *Rome*, whom they accurſe and Eccommunicate for faſhion ſake on *Maundy-Thurſday*, for detaining part of S. *Peters* Patrimony, and abſolve him without ſatisfaction on *Good-Friday*, methinks their faltring and inconſtancy herein, makes it very apparent. For though for the moſt part, they ſpeak nothing but thunder and lightning to us, and damn us all without mercy or exception, yet ſometimes to ſerve other purpoſes, they can be content to ſpeak to us in a milder ſtrain,

ſtrain, and tell us, as my adverſary does, more than once, *That they allow Proteſtants as much Charity as Proteſtants allow them.* Neither is this the only contradiction which I have diſcovered in this uncharitable Work; but have ſhewed that by forgetting himſelf, and retracting moſt of the principal grounds he builds upon, he hath ſaved me the labour of a confutation; which yet I have not in any place found any ſuch labour or difficulty, but that it was undertakeable by a man of very mean, that is, of my abilities. And the reaſon is, becauſe it is Truth I plead for; which is ſo ſtrong an argument for it ſelf, that it needs only light to diſcover it: whereas it concerns Falſhood and Error to uſe diſguiſes and ſhadowings and all the fetches of Art and Sophiſtry, and therefore it ſtands in need of abler men, to give that a colour at leaſt, which hath no real body to ſubſiſt by. If my endeavors in this kind may contribute any thing to this diſcovery, and the making plain that Truth (which my Charity perſwades me the moſt part of them diſaffect only, becauſe it has not been well repreſented to them,) I have the fruit of my labour, and my wiſh; who deſire to live to no other end, than to do ſervice to Gods Church and Your moſt Sacred Majeſty, in the quality of

Your Majeſties moſt faithful Subject,

and moſt humble and devoted Servant

WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH.

THE

THE PREFACE TO THE AUTHOR OF Charity Maintained.

With an Anſwer to his Direction to *N. N.*

SIR,

UPON the firſt news of the publication of your Book, I uſed all diligence with ſpeed to procure it; and came with ſuch a mind to the reading of it, as *S. Auſtin* before he was a ſetled Catholick, brought to his conference with *Fauſtus* the Manichee. For as he thought, that if any thing more then ordinary might be ſaid in defence of the Manichean Doctrine, *Fauſtus* was the man from whom it was to be expected: So my perſuaſion concerning you was,

Si Pergama dextrâ defendi poſſunt, certè hac defenſa videbo.

If *Troy* by any Power could ſtand,
'Twould be defended by your hand.

1. For I conceived that among the Champions of the Roman Church, the *Engliſh* in Reaſon muſt be the beſt, or equal to the beſt, as being by moſt expert Maſters trained up purpoſely for this war, and perpetually practiſed in it. Among the *Engliſh*, I ſaw the Jeſuits would yield the firſt place to none; and Men ſo wiſe in their generation as the Jeſuits were, if they had any *Achilles* among them, I preſumed, would make choice of him for this ſervice. And beſides, I had good aſſurance that in the framing of this building, though you were the only Architect, yet you

wanted not the assistance of many diligent hands to bring you in choice materials towards it; nor of many careful and watchful eyes to correct the errors of your work, if any should chance to escape you. Great reason therefore had I to expect great matters from you, and that your Book should have in it the Spirit and Elixir of all that can be said in defence of your Church and Doctrin; and to assure my self, that if my resolution not to believe it, were not built upon the rock of evident grounds and reasons, but only upon some sandy and deceitful appearances, now the Wind and Storm and Floods were coming, which would undoubtedly overthrow it.

2. Neither truly were you more willing to effect such an alteration in me than I was to have it effected. For my desire is to go the right way to *Eternal Happiness*. But whether this way lie on the right-hand or the left, or strait forwards; whether it be by following a living Guide, or by seeking my directions in a Book, or by hearkening to the secret whisper of some private Spirit, to me it is indifferent. And he that is otherwise affected, and has not a Travellers indifference, which *Epictetus* requires in all that would find the truth, but much desires in respect of his ease, or pleasure, or profit, or advancement, or satisfaction of friends, or any human consideration, that one way should be true rather than another; it is odds but he will take his desire that it should be so, for an assurance that it is so. But I for my part, unless I deceive my self, was and still am so affected as I have made profession: not willing I confess to take any thing upon trust, and to believe it without asking my self why; no, nor able to command my self (were I never so willing) to follow, like a sheep, every shepheard that should take upon him to guide me; or every Flock that should chance to go before me: but most apt and most willing to be led by reason to any way, or from it; and always submitting all other Reasons to this one, God hath said so, therefore it is true. Nor yet was I so unreasonable as to expect Mathematical demonstrations from you in matters plainly incapable of them, such as are to be *believed*, and if we speak properly, cannot be

be *known* ; ſuch therefore I expected not. For as he is an unreaſonable Maſter, who requires a ſtronger aſſent to his concluſions than his arguments deſerve ; ſo I conceive him a froward and undiſciplin'd Scholar, who deſires ſtronger arguments for a concluſion than the matter will bear. But had you repreſented to my underſtanding ſuch reaſons of your Doctrine, as being weighed in an even ballance, held by an even hand, with thoſe on the other ſide, would have turned the Scale, and have made your Religion more credible than the contrary ; certainly I ſhould have deſpiſed the ſhame of one more alteration, and with both mine armes and all my heart moſt readily have embraced it. Such was my expectation from you, and ſuch my preparation, which I brought with me to the reading of your Book.

3. Would you know now what the event was, what effect was wrought in me by the peruſal and conſideration of it ? To deal truly and ingenuouſly with you, I fell ſomwhat in my good opinion both of your ſufficiency and ſincerity : but was exceedingly confirmed in the ill opinion of the Cauſe maintained by you. I found every where Snares that might entrap, and Colours that might deceive the Simple ; but nothing that might perſuade, and very little that might move an underſtanding Man, and one that can diſcern between Diſcourſe and Sophiſtry. In ſhort, I was verily perſeaded that I plainly ſaw and could make it appear, to all diſ-paſſionate and unprejudicate Judges, that a vein of Sophiſtry and Calumny did run clean through it from the beginning to the end. And this I undertook with a full reſolution to be an adverſary to your Errors, but a Friend and Servant to your Perſon : and ſo much the more a Friend to your Perſon, by how much the ſeverer and more rigid Adverſary I was to your Errors.

4. In this work, my Conſcience bears me witneſs, that I have according to your advice *proceeded always with this conſideration, that I am to give a moſt ſtrict account of every line, and word that paſſeth under my Pen* ; and therefore have been preciſely careful for *the matter* of my Book to defend

truth only, and only by Truth. And then ſcrupulouſly fearful of Scandalizing you or any Man with the *manner* of handling it.

6. In your Pamphlet of Directions to *N. N.* you have loaded not only my perſon in particular, but all the Learned and Moderate Divines of the Church of *England*, and all Proteſtants in general, nay all wiſe Men of all Religions but your own, with unworthy Contumelies, and a Maſs of portentous and execrable Calumnies.

7. To begin with the laſt, you ſtick not in the beginning of your firſt Chapter, to faſten the imputation *of Atheiſm and Irreligion upon all wiſe and gallant Men, that are not of your own Religion.* In which uncharitable and unchriſtian Judgment, void of all colour or ſhadow of probability, I know yet by experience that very many of the *Bigots* of your Faction are partakers with you. God forbid I ſhould think the like of you! Yet if I ſhould ſay, that in your Religion there want not ſome temptations unto, and ſome Principles of Irreligion and Atheiſm, I am ſure I could make my Aſſertion much more probable than you have done, or can make this horrible imputation.

8. For to paſs by *firſt*, that which experience juſtifies, that where and when your Religion hath moſt abſolutely commanded, there and then Atheiſm hath moſt abounded; To ſay nothing *Secondly*, of your notorious and confeſſed forging of ſo many falſe Miracles, and ſo many lying Legends, which is not unlikely to make ſuſpitious men to queſtion the truth of all: Nor to object to you *Thirdly*, the abundance of your weak and ſilly Ceremonies and ridiculous Obſervances in your Religion, which in all probability cannot but beget ſecret contempt and ſcorn of it in wiſe and conſidering men, and conſequently Atheiſm and Impiety, if they have this perſuaſion ſetled in them (which is too rife among you, and which you account a piece of *Wiſdom and Gallantry*) that if they be not of your Religion, they were as good be of none at all: Nor to trouble you *Fourthly* with this, that a great part of your Doctrine, eſpecially in the Points conteſted,

teſted, makes apparently for the temporal ends of the teachers of it; which yet I fear is a great ſcandal to many *Beaux Eſprits* among you: Only I ſhould deſire you to conſider attentively when you conclude ſo often from the differences of Proteſtants, that they have no certainty of any part of their Religion, no not of thoſe Points wherein they agree, whether you do not that which ſo magiſterially you direct me not to do, that is, proceed *a deſtructive way, and object arguments againſt your adverſaries, which tend to the overthrow of all Religion?* And whether as you argue thus, *Proteſtants differ in many things, therefore they have no certainty of any thing:* So an Atheiſt or a Sceptick may not conclude as well, Chriſtians, and the Profeſſors of all Religions differ in many things, therefore they have no certainty of any thing? Again, I ſhould deſire you to tell me ingenuouſly, whether it be not too probable that your portentous Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, joyn'd with your forementiond perſuaſion of, *No Papiſts no Chriſtians*, hath brought a great many others as well as himſelf, to *Averroes*'s reſolution, *Quandoquidem Chriſtiani adorant quod comedunt, ſit anima mea cum Philoſophis? Foraſmuch as the Chriſtians worſhip that which they eat, let my Soul be with the Philoſophers.* Whether your requiring men upon only probable and *Prudential motives*, to yield a *moſt certain aſſent* unto things in humane reaſon impoſſible, and telling them, as you do too often, that they were as good not believe at all, as believe with any lower degree of Faith, be not a likely way to make conſidering men ſcorn your Religion, (and conſequently all, if they know no other) as requiring things contradictory, and impoſſible to be performed? Laſtly, Whether your pretence that there is no good ground to believe Scripture, but your Churches infallibility, joyn'd with your pretending no ground for this but ſome Texts of Scripture, be not a fair way to make them that underſtand themſelves, believe neither Church nor Scripture?

9. Your Calumnies againſt Proteſtants in general are ſet down in theſe words, Chap. 2. §. 2. *The very doctrine*

of

of Proteſtants, if it be followed cloſely, and with coherence to it ſelf, muſt of neceſſity induce Socinianiſm. *This I ſay confidently, and evidently prove, by inſtancing in one Error, which may well be termed the Capital and Mother-hereſie, from which all other muſt follow at eaſe; I mean, their Hereſie in affirming that the perpetual viſible Church of Chriſt, deſcended by a never interrupted Succeſſion from our Saviour to this day, is not infallible in all that it propoſeth to be believed as revealed truths.*

For if the Infallibility *of ſuch a publick* Authority *be once impeached; what remains, but that every man is given over to his own* wit *and* diſcourſe? *and talk not here of holy Scripture, for if the true Church may err, in defining what Scriptures be Canonical; or in delivering the ſenſe and meaning thereof, we are ſtill devolved, either upon the* private Spirit *(a foolery now exploded out of* England, *which finally leaving every man to his own conceits, ends in* Socinianiſm) *or elſe upon* natural wit *and* judgment, *for examining and determining what Scriptures contain true or falſe Doctrine, and in that reſpect ought to be received or rejected. And indeed, take away the authority of Gods Church, no man can be aſſured, that any one Book or parcel of Scripture was written by Divine Inſpiration; or that all the Contents are infallibly true, which are the direct Errors of* Socinians. *If it were but for this reaſon alone, no man, who regards the eternal ſalvation of his Soul, would live or die in* Proteſtancy, *from which, ſo vaſt abſurdities as theſe of the* Socinians *muſt inevitably follow. And it ought to be an unſpeakable comfort to all us Catholicks, while we conſider, that none can deny the infallible authority of our Church, but jointly he muſt be left to his own wit and ways, and muſt abandon all* infuſed Faith *and true Religion, if he do but underſtand himſelf aright.* In all which Diſcourſe, the only true word you ſpeak, is, *This I ſay confidently:* As for *proving evidently*, that I believe you reſerved for ſome other opportunity: for the preſent I am ſure you have been very ſparing of it.

10. You ſay indeed confidently enough, that *the denyal of the Churches infallibility is the Mother-hereſie, from which all other muſt follow at eaſe*; which is ſo far from being

being a necessary truth, as you make it, that it is indeed a manifest falshood. Neither is it possible for the wit of man by any good, or so much as probable consequence, from the denialaof the Churches Infallibility to deduce any one of the ancient Heresies, or any one Error of the *Socinians*, which are the Heresies here entreated of: For who would not laugh at him that should argue thus, Neither the Church of *Rome*, nor any other Church is infallible, *Ergo*, The Doctrine of *Arrius*, *Pelagius*, *Eutyches*, *Nestorius*, *Photinus*, *Manichæus*, was true Doctrine? On the other side, it may be truly said, and justificd by very good and effectual reason, that he that affirms with you the Popes Infallibility, puts himself into his hands and power to be led by him at his ease and pleasure into all Heresie, and even to Hell it self, and cannot with reason say, (so long as he is constant to his grounds) *Domine cur ita facis?* Sir, *Why do you thus?* but must believe *white to be black, and black to be white*; *vertue to be vice, and vice to be vertue*; nay (which is a horrible, but a most certain truth) Christ to be Antichrist, and Antichrist to be Christ, if it be possible for the Pope to say so: Which I say and will maintain, howsoever you daub and disguise it, is indeed to make men apostate from Christ to his pretended Vicar, but real Enemy: For that name, and no better, (if we may speak truth without offence) I presume he deserves, who under pretence of interpreting the Law of Christ, (which Authority, without any word of express warrant, he hath taken upon himself) doth in many parts evacuate and dissolve it: So dethroning Christ from his dominion over mens consciences, and instead of Christ setting up himself. In as much as he that requires that his Interpretations of any Law should be obeyed as true and genuine, seem they to mens understandings never so dissonant and discordant from it, (as the Bishop of *Rome* does) requires indeed that *his Interpretations* should be the *Laws*; and he that is firmly prepared in mind to believe and receive all such Interpretations without judging of them, and though to his private judgment they seem unreasonable, is indeed congruously disposed

poſed to hold Adultery a venial ſin, and Fornication no ſin, whenſoever the Pope and his adherents ſhall ſo declare. And whatſoever he may plead, yet either wittingly or ignorantly he makes the Law and the Law-maker both ſtales, and obeys only the Interpreter. As if I ſhould ſubmit to the Laws of the King of *England*, but ſhould indeed reſolve to obey them in that ſence which the King of *France* ſhould put upon them whatſoever it were; I preſume every underſtanding man would ſay that I did indeed obey the King of *France* and not the King of *England*. If I ſhould pretend to believe the Bible, but that I would underſtand it accordingly to the ſenſe which the chief Mufty ſhould put upon it, who would not ſay that I were a Chriſtian in pretence only, but indeed a Mahumetan?

11. Nor will it be to purpoſe for you to pretend that the precepts of Chriſt are ſo plain that it cannot be feared, that any Pope ſhould ever go about to diſſolve them and pretend to be a Chriſtian: For, not to ſay that you now pretend the contrary, (to wit), *that the Law of Chriſt is obſcure, even in things neceſſary to be believed and done*; and by ſaying ſo, have made a fair way for any foul interpretation of any part of it: certainly that which the Church of *Rome* hath already done in this kind, is an evident argument, (that if ſhe once had this Power unqueſtioned and made expedite and ready for uſe, by being contracted to the Pope) ſhe may do what ſhe pleaſeth with it. Who that had lived in the Primative Church, would not have thought it as utterly improbable, that ever they ſhould have brought in the Worſhip of Images and Picturing of God, as now it is that they ſhould legitimate Fornication? Why may we not think they may in time take away the whole Communion from the Laity, as well as they have taken away half of it? Why may we not think that any Text and any ſenſe may not be accorded, as well as the whole 14. *Ch.* of the *Ep.* of S. *Paul* to the *Corinth.* is reconciled to the Latine ſervice? How is it poſſible any thing ſhould be plainer forbidden, than the *Worſhip of Angels*, in the *Ep.* to the *Coloſſians*? than *the teaching for Doctrines*

Crimes Mens commands in the Goſpel of *S. Mark*? And therefore ſeeing we ſee theſe things done which hardly any man would have believed, that had not ſeen them, why ſhould we not fear that this unlimited Power may not be uſed hereafter with as little moderation? Seeing devices have been invented how Men may worſhip Images without Idolatry, and Kill Innocent Men under pretence of Hereſie without Murther, who knows not that ſome tricks may not be hereafter deviſed, by which lying with other Mens Wives ſhall be no Adultery, taking away other Mens Goods no Theft? I conclude therefore, that if *Solomon* himſelf were here, and were to determine the difference, which is more likely to be Mother of all Hereſie, the *denial* of the *Churches*, or the *affirming* of the *Popes Infallibility*, that he would certainly ſay, *this is the Mother, give her the Child.*

12. You ſay again confidently, that *if this Infallibility be once impeached, every Man is given over to his own Wit and Diſcourſe:* which, if you mean, *Diſcourſe*, not guiding it ſelfe by Scripture, but only by principles of Nature, or perhaps by prejudices and popular errors, and drawing conſequences not by rule but chance, is by no means true; if you mean by Diſcourſe, right reaſon, grounded on Divine revelation and common notions, written by God in the hearts of all Men, and deducing, according to the never failing rules of Logick, conſequent deductions from them, if this be it, which you mean by *Diſcourſe*, it is very meet and reaſonable and neceſſary that Men, as in all their actions, ſo eſpecially in that of greateſt importance, the choice of their way to happineſs, ſhould be left unto it: and he that follows this in all his opinions and actions, and does not only ſeem to do ſo, follows alwaies God; whereas he that followeth a Company of Men, may oftimes follow a Company of Beaſts. And in ſaying this, I ſay no more than S. *John* to all Chriſtians in theſe words, *Dearly beloved, Believe not every ſpirit, but try the ſpirits, whether they be of God, or no*: and the rule he gives them to make this tryal by, is to conſider whether they *confeſs Jeſus to be the Chriſt*; that is, the Guide of their Faith, and

Lord of their actions; not whether they acknowledg the *Pope* to be his Vicar: I ſay no more than S. *Paul* in exhorting all Chriſtians, *to try all things and to hold faſt that which is good*; than S. *Peter* in commanding all Chriſtians, *to be ready to give a reaſon of the hope that is in them*: than *our Saviour* himſelf in forewarning all his followers, that *if they blindly followed blind Guides, both leaders and followers ſhould fall into the Ditch*; and again in ſaying even to the People, *Yea and why of your ſelves Judge ye not what is right?* And though by paſſion, or precipitation, or prejudice; by want of Reaſon, or not uſing that they have, Men may be and are oftentimes led into Error and miſchief; yet that they cannot be miſguided by diſcourſe truly ſo called, ſuch as I have deſcribed, you your ſelf have given them ſecurity. For what is diſcourſe, but drawing concluſions out of premiſes by good conſequence? Now the principles which we have ſetled, to wit, the *Scriptures*, are on all ſides agreed to be infallibly true. And you have told us in the fourth chap. of this Pamphlet, that *from truth no man can by good conſequence infer falſhood*; Therefore by diſcourſe no Man can poſſibly be led to Error: but if he Err in his concluſions, he muſt of neceſſity either Err in his principles, (which here cannot have place,) or commit ſome Error in his diſcourſe; that is indeed, not diſcourſe but ſeem to do ſo.

13. You ſay thirdly, with ſufficient confidence, that *if the true Church may Err in defining what Scriptures be Canonical, or in delivering the ſenſe thereof, then we muſt follow either the private Spirit, or elſe natural wit and Judgment, and by them examine what Scriptures contain true or falſe Doctrine, and in that reſpect ought to be received or rejected*: All which is apparently untrue, neither can any proof of it be pretended. For though the preſent Church may poſſibly Err in her judgment touching this matter, yet have we other Directions in it, beſides the private ſpirit, and the examination of the Contents, (which latter way may conclude the negative very ſtrongly, to wit, that ſuch or ſuch a Book cannot come from God, becauſe it contains irreconcilable contradictions, but the affirmative

it

it cannot conclude, becauſe the Contents of a Book may be all true, and yet the Book not written by Divine inſpiration:) other Direction therefore I ſay we have, beſides either of theſe three, and that is, the Teſtimony of the Primitive Chriſtians.

14. You ſay Fourthly, with convenient boldneſs, That *this infallible Authority of your Church being denied, no man can be aſſured, that any parcel of Scripture was written by Divine inſpiration*: Which is an untruth, for which no proof is pretended, and beſides, void of modeſty and full of impiety. The firſt, becauſe the experience of innumerable Chriſtians is againſt it, who are ſufficiently aſſured, that the Scripture is Divinely inſpired, and yet deny the infallible Authority of your Church or any other. The ſecond, becauſe if I cannot have ground to be aſſured of the Divine Authority of Scripture, unleſs I firſt believe your Church infallible, then I can have no ground at all to believe it: becauſe there is no ground, nor can any be pretended, why I ſhould believe your Church *Infallible*, unleſs I firſt believe the Scripture Divine.

16. Had I a mind to recriminate now, and to charge Papiſts (as you do Proteſtants) that they lead Men to Socinianiſm, I could certainly make a much fairer ſhew of evidence than you have done. For I would not tell you, you deny the Infallibility of the Church of *England*, *Ergo*, you lead to Socinianiſm, which yet is altogether as good an Argument as this; Proteſtants deny the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, *Ergo*, they induce Socinianiſm: Nor would I reſume my former Argument, and urge you, that by holding the *Popes* Infallibility, you ſubmit your ſelf to that Capital and Mother Hereſie, by advantage whereof, he may lead you at eaſe to believe *vertue vice*, and *vice vertue*, to believe Antichriſtianity Chriſtianiſm, and Chriſtianity Antichriſtian; he may lead you to Socinianiſm, to Turciſm, nay, to the Divel himſelf if he have a mind to it: But I would ſhew you that divers ways the Doctors of your Church do the principal and proper work of the Socinians for them, undermining the Doctrine of the Trinity, by denying it to be ſuppor-

ted by thoſe Pillars of the Faith, which alone are fit and able to ſupport it, I mean Scripture, and the Conſent of the Ancient Doctors.

17. For *Scripture*, your Men deny very plainly and frequently, that this Doctrine can be proved by it. See if you pleaſe, this plainly taught, and urged very carneſtly by Cardinal *Hoſius*, *De Author. Sac. Scrip. l. 3. p. 53.* By *Gordonius Huntlæus*, *Contr. Tom. 1. Controv. 1. De verbo Dei* C. 19. by *Gretſerus* and *Tanerus*, *in Colloquio Ratesbon*: And alſo by *Vega*, *Poſſevin*, *Wiekus*, and *Others*.

18. And then for *the Conſent of the Ancients*, that that alſo delivers it not, by whom are we taught but by Papiſts only? Who is it that makes known to all the World, that *Euſebius* that great ſearcher and devourer of the Chriſtian Libraries *was an Arrian?* Is it not your great *Achilles*, *Cardinal Perron*, in his 3. Book 2. Chap. of his Reply to K. *James?* Who is it that informs us that *Origen* (who never was queſtioned for any Error in this matter, in or near his time) *denyed the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt?* Is it not the ſame great Cardinal, in his Book *of the Euchariſt* againſt *M. du Pleſſis. l. 2. c. 7?* Who is it that pretends that *Irenæus hath ſaid thoſe things, which he that ſhould now hold, would be eſteemed an Arrian?* Is it not the ſame *Perron* in his Reply to K. *James*, in the Fifth Chap. of his Fourth Obſervation? And does he not in the ſame place peach *Tertullian* alſo, and in a manner give him away to the *Arrians?* And pronounce generally of the *Fathers before the Council of Nice*, That *the* Arrians *would gladly be tryed by them?* And are not your fellow Jeſuits alſo, even the Prime Men of your Order, prevaricators in this point as well as others? Doth not your Friend M. *Fiſher*, or M. *Flued* in his Book of the Nine Queſtions propoſed to him by K. *James* ſpeak dangerouſly to the ſame purpoſe, in his Diſcourſe *of the Reſolution of Faith*, towards the end? Giving us to underſtand, *That the new Reformed* Arrians *bring very many Teſtimonies of the Ancient Fathers, to prove that in this Point they did contradict themſelves, and were contrary one to another: which places whoſoever ſhall read will clearly ſee, that to*

common

common People they are unanſwerable, yea, that common People are not capable of the Anſwers that Learned Men yield unto ſuch obſcure paſſages. And hath not your great Antiquary *Petavius*, in his Notes upon *Epiphanius in Hær.* 69. been very liberal to the Adverſaries of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and in a manner given them for Patrons and Advocates, firſt *Juſtin Martyr*, and then almoſt all the Fathers before the Council of *Nice*, whoſe Speeches he ſays, touching this point, *cum Orthodoxæ fidei regula minime conſentiunt*: *Are no way agreeable to the rule of Orthodox Faith.* Hereunto I might add, that the Dominicans and Jeſuits between them in another matter of great importance, viz. *Gods Preſcience of future contingents*, give the *Socinians* the premiſes, out of which their concluſion doth unavoidably follow. For the *Dominicans* maintain on the one Side, that *God can foreſee nothing but what he Decrees*: The Jeſuits on the other Side, that *he doth not Decree all things*: And from hence the *Socinians* conclude (as it is obvious for them to do) that *he doth not foreſee all things.* Laſtly, I might adjoyn this, that you agree with one conſent, and ſettle for a rule unqueſtionable, that no part of Religion can be repugnant to Reaſon, whereunto you in particular ſubſcribe unawares in ſaying, *From truth no Man can by good conſequence infer falſhood*, which is to ſay in effect, that Reaſon can never lead any Man to Error: And after you have done ſo, you proclaim to all the World (as you in this Pamphlet do very frequently,) that *if Men follow their Reaſon and Diſcourſe*, they will (if they underſtand themſelves) be led to *Socinianiſm.* And thus you ſee with what probable matter I might furniſh out and juſtifie my accuſation, if I ſhould charge you with leading Men to *Socinianiſm*! Yet I do not conceive that I have ground enough for this odious imputation. And much leſs ſhould you have charged *Proteſtants* with it, whom you confeſs to abhor and deteſt it: and who fight againſt it, not with the broken Reeds, and out of the Paper Fortreſſes of an imaginary Infallibility, which were only to make ſport for their Adverſaries; but with the *Sword of the Spirit, the Word of God*: of which we may

ſay

ſay moſt truly, what *David* ſaid of *Goliah's* Sword, offered him by *Abilech*, *non eſt ſicut iſte, There is none comparable to it.*

19. Thus *Proteſtants* in general, I hope, are ſufficiently vindicated from your Calumny: I proceed now to do the ſame ſervice for the Divines of *England*; whom you queſtion firſt in point of Learning and Sufficiency, and then in point of Conſcience and Honeſty, as prevaricating in the Religion which they profeſs, and inclining to *Popery*. Their Learning (you ſay) conſiſts only in *ſome ſuperficial Talent of Preaching, Languages, and Elocution, and not in any deep knowledg of Philoſophy, eſpecially of Metaphyſicks, and much leſs of that moſt ſolid, profitable, ſubtile,* & (O rem ridiculam *Cato* & jocoſam!) *ſuccinct method of School Divinity.* Wherein you have diſcovered in your ſelf the true Genius and Spirit of detraction. For taking advantage from that wherein envy it ſelf cannot deny but they are very eminent, and which requires great ſufficiency of ſubſtantial Learning, you diſparage them as inſufficient in all things elſe. As if Forſooth, becauſe they diſpute not eternally. *Utrum Chimæra bombinans in vacuo, poſſit comedere ſecundas Intentiones? Whether a Million of Angels may not ſit upon a Needles point?* Becauſe they fill not their Brains with notions that ſignifie nothing, to the utter extermination of all reaſon and common ſence, and ſpend not an Age in weaving and un-weaving ſubtile Cobwebs, fitter to catch Flies than Souls; therefore they have no deep knowledge in the Acroamatical part of Learning! But I have too much honoured the poorneſs of this detraction to take notice of it.

20. The other Part of your accuſation ſtrikes deeper, and is more conſiderable: And that tells us that, *Proteſtantiſm waxeth weary of it ſelf; that the Profeſſors of it, they eſpecially of greateſt Worth, Learning, and Authority, love temper and moderation: and are at this time more unreſolved where to faſten, than at the Infancy of their Church:* That *their Churches begin to look with a New Face: Their Walls to Speak a New Language: Their Doctrine to be altered in many things, for which their Progenitors forſook the then Viſible*

Viſible Church of Chriſt : *For example, the* Pope *not Antichriſt* : *Prayer for the Dead* : *Limbus Patrum* : *Pictures* : *That the Church hath Authority in determining Controverſies of Faith, and to interpret Scripture* ; *about Freewil, Predeſtination, Univerſal Grace* : That *all our Works are not Sins* : *Merit of good Works* : *Inherent Juſtice* : *Faith alone doth not juſtifie* : *Charity to be preferred before knowledg* : *Traditions* : *Commandments poſſible to be kept* : That *their thirty nine Articles are patient, nay ambitious of ſome ſence wherein they may ſeem Catholick* : That to *Alledge the neceſſity of Wife and Children in theſe days, is but a weak Plea for a Married Miniſter to compaſs a Benefice* : That *Calviniſm is at length accounted Hereſie, and little leſs than Treaſon* : That *Men in Talk and Writing uſe willingly the once fearful Names of Prieſts and Altars* : That *they are now put in mind, that for expoſition of Scripture, they are by* Canon *bound to follow the Fathers* : *which if they do with ſincerity, it is eaſie to tell what Doom will paſs againſt* Proteſtants ; *ſeeing by the confeſſion of* Proteſtants, *the Fathers are on the* Papiſts *ſide, which the Anſwerer to ſome ſo clearly demonſtrated, that they remained convinced* : *In fine, as the* Samaritans *ſaw in the Diſciples countenances, that they meant to go to* Hieruſalem, *ſo you pretend it is even legible in the Fore-heads of theſe Men, that they are even going, nay making haſt to* Rome. Which ſcurrilous Libel void of all Truth, Diſcretion and Honeſty, what effect it may have wrought, what credit it may have gained with credulous *Papiſts*, (who dream what they deſire, and believe their own dreams,) or with ill-affected, jealous, and weak *Proteſtants*, I cannot tell : But one thing I dare boldly ſay, that you your ſelf did never believe it.

21. The truth is, they that run to extreams in oppoſition againſt you, they that pull down your Infallibility and ſet up their own, they that declaim againſt your Tyranny, and exerciſe it themſelves over others, are the Adverſaries that give you the greateſt advantage, and ſuch as you love to deal with : whereas upon Men of temper and moderation, ſuch as will oppoſe nothing becauſe you maintain it, but will draw as near to you, that they may

may draw you to them, as the Truth will ſuffer them: ſuch as require of Chriſtians to believe only in Chriſt, and will Damn no Man nor Doctrine without expreſs and certain warrant from Gods Word: upon ſuch as theſe you know not how to faſten; but if you chance to have conference with any ſuch, (which yet as much as poſſibly you can you avoid and decline,) you are very ſpeedily put to ſilence, and ſee the indefenſible weakneſs of your cauſe laid open to all Men. And this I verily believe is the true Reaſon that you thus rave and rage againſt them, as foreſeeing your time of prevailing, or even of ſubſiſting, would be ſhort, if other adverſaries gave you no more advantage than they do.

22. In which perſwaſion alſo I am much confirmed by conſideration of the Silline's and Poorneſs of thoſe ſuggeſtions, and partly of the apparent vanity and Falſhood of them, which you offer in juſtification of this wicked Calumny. For what if out of Devotion towards God; out of a deſire that He ſhould be Worſhiped as *in Spirit and Truth* in the firſt place, ſo alſo *in the Beauty of Holineſs*? what if out of fear, that too much Simplicity and Nakedneſs in the publick Service of God may beget in the ordinary ſort of Men a dull and ſtupid irreverence, and out of hope that the outward State and Glory of it, being well diſpoſed and wiſely moderated, may ingender, quicken, encreaſe and nouriſh the inward reverence, reſpect and devotion which is due unto Gods Sovereign Majeſty and Power? What if out of a perſuaſion and deſire that *Papiſts* may be won over to us the ſooner, by the removing of this Scandal out of their way; and out of an Holy Jealouſie, that the weaker ſort of *Proteſtants* might be the eaſier ſeduced to them by the Magnificence and Pomp of their Church-ſervice in caſe it were not removed? I ſay, what if out of theſe conſiderations, the Governors of our Church, more of late than formerly, have ſet themſelves to adorn and beautifie the places *where Gods Honour dwells*, and to make them as Heavenly as they can with Earthly Ornaments? Is this a ſign that they are warping towards *Popery*? Is this Devotion

in

in the Church of *England*, an argument that She is coming over to the Church of *Rome*? Sir *Edwin Sands*, I preſume every Man will grant, had no inclination that way; yet He Forty Years ſince highly commended this part of Devotion in *Papiſts*, and makes no ſcruple of propoſing it to the imitation of *Proteſtants*: little thinking that they who would follow his Counſel, and endeavour to take away this diſparagement of *Proteſtants*, and this Glorying of *Papiſts*, ſhould have been cenſured for it, as making way and inclining to *Popery*. His Words to this purpoſe are excellent Words, and becauſe they ſhew plainly, that what is now practiſed was approved by Zealous *Proteſtants* ſo long ago, I will here ſet them down. Survey of Religion.

23. *This one thing I cannot but highly commend in that ſort and Order: They ſpare nothing which either coſt can perform in enriching, or skill in adorning the Temple of God, or to ſet out his Service with the greateſt Pomp and magnificence that can be deviſed. And although, for the moſt part, much Baſeneſs and Childiſhneſs is predominant in the Maſters and contrivers of their Ceremonies, yet this outward State and Glory being well diſpoſed, doth ingender, quicken, increaſe, and nouriſh the inward reverence, reſpect and Devotion, which is due unto Sovereign Majeſty and Power. And although I am not ignorant that many Men well reputed have embraced the thrifty Opinion of that Diſciple, who thought all to be waſted that was beſtowed upon Chriſt in that ſort, and that it were much better beſtowed upon him on the Poor, (yet with an eye perhaps that themſelves would be his quarter Almoners,) notwithſtanding I muſt confeſs, it will never ſink into my Heart, that in proportion of Reaſon, the allowance for furniſhing out of the Service of God ſhould be meaſured by the ſcant and ſtrict rule of meer neceſſity, (a proportion ſo low that Nature to other moſt bountiful in matter of neceſſity, hath not failed no not the moſt ignoble Creatures of the World,) and that for our ſelves no meaſure of heaping but the moſt we can get, no rule of expence but to the utmoſt Pomp we liſt: Or that God himſelf had ſo inriched the lower parts of the World with ſuch wonderfull varieties of Beauty and Glory, thut they might ſerve only to the Pampering of Mortal Man in his Pride; and*

that in the Service of the High Creator Lord and giver, (the outward Glory of whose higher Pallace may appear by the very Lamps that we see so far off Burning glorionsly in it) only the Simpler, Baser, Cheaper, Less Noble, Less Beautiful, Less Glorious things should be imployed. Especially seeing as in Princes Courts, so in the Service of God also, this outward State and Glory, being well disposed, doth (as I have said) ingender, quicken, increase and nourish the inward reverence, respect and Devotion, which is due to so Sovereign Majesty and Power. Which those whom the use thereof cannot persuade unto, would easily by the want of it be brought to confess; for which cause I crave leave to be excused by them herein, if in Zeal to the common Lord of all, I choose rather to commend the vertue of an Enemy than to flatter the vice and imbecility of a Friend. And so much for this matter.

24. Again, what if the Names of the *Priests* and *Altars* so frequent in the Ancient Fathers, though not in the now *Popish* sense, be now resumed and more commonly used in *England* than of late times they were: that so the colourable argument of their conformity, which is but nominal, with the Ancient Church, and our inconformity, which the Governors of the Church would not have so much as nominal, may be taken away from them; and the Church of *England* may be put in a State, in this regard more justifiable against the *Roman* than formerly it was, being hereby enabled to say to *Papists* (whensoever these Names are objected,) we also use the Names of *Priests* and *Altars*, and yet believe neither the Corporal Presence, nor any Proper and propitiatory Sacrifice?

25. What if *Protestants* be now put in mind, that for exposition of Scripture, they are bound by a *Canon to follow the Ancient Fathers*: which whosoever doth with sincerity, it is utterly impossible he should be a *Papist*? And it is most falsly said by you, that you know that to some *Protestants* I clearly demonstrated, or ever so much as undertook, or went about to demonstrate the contrary. What if the Centurists be censured somewhat roundly by a *Protestant* Divine for affirming, that *the keeping of the Lords day was a thing indifferent for two Hundren Years?* Is there in

all this or any part of it any kind of proof of this ſcandalous Calumny?

26. As for the points of Doctrine wherein you pretend that theſe Divines begin of late to falter, and to comply with the Church of *Rome*, upon a due examination of particulars it will preſently appear, *Firſt*, that part of them always have been, and now are held conſtantly one way by them; as the Authority of the Church in determining Controverſies of Faith, though not the Infallibility of it: That there is Inherent Juſtice, though ſo imperfect that it cannot juſtifie: That there are Traditions, though none neceſſary: That Charity is to be preferred before knowledg: That good Works are not properly meritorious: And laſtly, that Faith alone juſtifies, though that Faith juſtifies not which is alone. And *Secondly*, for the remainder that they, every one of them, have been Anciently without breach of Charity diſputed among *Proteſtants*, ſuch for example were the Queſtions about the *Popes* being the Antichriſt, the Lawfulneſs of ſome kind of Prayers for the Dead, the Eſtate of the Fathers Souls, before Chriſts Aſcenſion; Freewil, Predeſtination, Univerſal Grace: the Poſſibility of keeping Gods Commandments. The uſe of Pictures in the Church: Wherein that there hath been anciently diverſity of opinion anongſt *Proteſtants*, it is juſtified to my hand by a witneſs, with you, beyond exception, even your great Friend M. *Brerely*, *whoſe care, exactneſs and fidelity* (you ſay in your Preface) *is ſo extraordinary great*. Conſult him therefore: Tract. 3. Sect. 7. of his *Apology*: And in the 9, 10, 11. 14. 24. 26. 27. 37. Subdiviſions of that *Section*, you ſhall ſee as in a mirror, your ſelf proved an egregious calumniator, for charging *Proteſtants* with innovation and inclining to *Popery*, under pretence forſooth, that their Doctrine begins of late to be altered in theſe points. Whereas, M *Brerely* will inform you, they have been anciently, and even from the beginning of the Reformation, controverted amongſt them, though perhaps the Stream and Current of their Doctors run one way, and only ſome Brook or Rivulet of them the other.

27. It remains now in the laſt place, that I bring my ſelf fairly off from your foul Aſperſions, that ſo my Perſon may not be any diſparagement to the Cauſe, nor any ſcandal to weak Chriſtians.

28. Firſt upon Hearſay, you charge me with a great number of falſe and impious Doctrines, which I will not name in particular, becauſe I will not aſſiſt you ſo far in the ſpreading of my own undeſerved defamation: but whoſoever teaches or holds them *let him be Anathema*! The Summ of them all is this, *Nothing ought or can be certainly believed, farther than it may be proved by evidence of Natural Reaſon:* (where I conceive Natural reaſon it oppoſed to ſupernatural Revelation) and whoſoever holds ſo *let him be Anathema*! And moreover to clear my ſelf once for all, from all imputations of this nature, which charge me injuriouſly with denial of Supernatural Verities, I profeſs ſincerely, that I believe all thoſe Books of Scripture, which the Church of *England* accounts Canonical, to be the Infallible Word of God: I believe all things evidently contained in them; all things evidently, or even probably deducible from them: I acknowledge all that to be Hereſie, which by the Act of Parliament *primo of Q.* Eliz. is declared to be ſo, and only to be ſo: And though in ſuch points which may be held diverſly of divers men *ſalvâ Fidei compage*, I would not take any Mans Liberty from him, and humbly beſeech all men, that they would not take mine from me! Yet thus much I can ſay (which I hope will ſatisfie any man of reaſon,) that whatſoever hath been held neceſſary to Salvation, either by the Catholick Church of all ages, or by the conſent of Fathers, meaſured by *Vincentius Lyrinenſis* his rule, or is held neceſſary either by the Catholick Church of this age, or by the conſent of *Proteſtants*, or even by the Church of *England*, that, againſt the *Socinians*, and all others whatſoever, I do verily believe and embrace.

29. But what are all Perſonal matters to the buſineſs in hand? If it could be proved that Cardinal *Bellarmine* was indeed a *Jew*, or that Cardinal *Perron* was an *Atheiſt*, yet I preſume you would not accept of this for an Anſwer

to

to all their writings in defence of your Religion. Let then my actions and intentions and opinions be what they will, yet I hope truth is nevertheleſs Truth, nor reaſon ever the leſs Reaſon becauſe I ſpeak it. And therefore the Chriſtian Reader, knowing that his Salvation or Damnation depends upon his impartial and ſincere judgment of theſe things, will guard himſelf I hope from theſe Impoſtures, and regard not the Perſon but the cauſe and the reaſons of it; not who ſpeaks but what is ſpoken: Which is all the favour I deſire of him, as knowing that I am deſirous not to perſuade him, unleſs it be truth whereunto I perſuade him.

30. The laſt Accuſation is, That *I anſwer out of Principles which* Proteſtants *themſelves will profeſs to deteſt*: which indeed were to the purpoſe if it could be juſtified. But, beſides that it is confuted by my whole Book, and made ridiculous by the Approbations premiſed unto it, it is very eaſie for me out of your own Mouth and Words to prove it a moſt injurious calumny. For what one Concluſion is there in the whole Fabrick of my Diſcourſe, that is not naturally deducible out of this one Principle, That *all things neceſſary to Salvation are evidently contained in Scripture?* Or what one Concluſion almoſt of importance is there in your Book, which is not by this one clearly confutable? Grant this, and it will preſently follow in oppoſition to your firſt Concluſion, and the argument of your firſt Ch: that amongſt men of different opinions, touching the obſcure and controverted Queſtions of Religion, ſuch as may with probability be diſputed on both Sides (and ſuch as are the diſputes of *Proteſtants*;) Good men and lovers of truth of all Sides may be ſaved; becauſe all neceſſary things being ſuppoſed evident, concerning them, with men ſo qualified, there will be no difference: There being no more certain ſign that a Point is not evident, than that honeſt and underſtanding and indifferent men, and ſuch as give themſelves liberty of judgment, after a mature conſideration of the matter differ about it.

31. Grant

31. Grant this, and it will appear, *Secondly*, that the means whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our understanding, and which are to determine all Controversies in Faith, necessary to be determined, may be, for any thing you have said to the contrary, not a Church but the Scripture; which contradicts the Doctrine of your *Second Chapter.*

32. Grant this, and the distinction of points Fundamental and not Fundamental, will appear very good and pertinent. For those truths will be Fundamental, which are evidently delivered in Scripture, and commanded to be Preached to all men; Those not Fundamental which are obscure. And nothing will hinder, but that the Catholick Church may Err in the latter kind of the said points: because Truths not necessary to the Salvation, cannot be necessary to the being of a Church; and because it is not absolutely necessary that God should assist his Church any farther than to bring Her to Salvation; neither will there be any necessity at all of any Infallible Guide, either to consign unwritten Traditions, or to declare the obscurities of the Faith. Not for the former end, because this Principle being granted true, nothing unwritten can be necessary to be consigned. Nor for the latter, because nothing that is obscure can be necessary to be understood, or not mistaken. And so the discourse of your whole *Third Chap:* will presently vanish.

33. *Fourthly*, for the Creed's containing the Fundamentals of simple belief, though I see not how it may be deduced from this principle, yet the granting of this plainly renders the whole dispute touching the Creed necessary. For if all necessary things of all sorts, whether of simple belief or practice be confessed to be clearly contained in Scripture, what imports it whether those of one sort be contained in the Creed?

34. *Fifthly*, let this be granted, and the immediate Corollary in opposition to your Fifth Chap. will be and must be, That, not Protestants for rejecting, but the Church of *Rome* for imposing upon the Faith of Christians, Doctrines unwritten and unnecessary, and for disturbing

ſturbing the Churches Peace, and dividing Unity for ſuch matters, is in a high degree preſumptuous and Schiſmatical.

35. Grant this, *ſixthly*, and it will follow unavoidably that *Proteſtants* cannot poſſibly be Hereticks, ſeeing they believe all things evidently contained in Scripture, which are ſuppoſed to be all that is neceſſary to be believed: and ſo your *Sixth Chapter* is clearly confuted.

36. Grant this Laſtly, and it will be undoubtedly conſequent, in contradiction of your *Seventh Chapter*, that no Man can ſhew more Charity to himſelf than by continuing a *Proteſtant*, ſeeing *Proteſtants* are ſuppoſed to believe, and therefore may accordingly practice, at leaſt by their Religion are not hindered from practiſing and performing all things neceſſary to Salvation.

37. So that the poſition of this one Principle, is the direct overthrow of your whole Book, and therefore I needed not, nor indeed have I made uſe of any other. Now this principle, which is not only the Corner-ſtone or chief Pillar, but even the baſe, and adequate Foundation of my Anſwer; and which while it ſtands firm and unmovable, cannot but be the ſupporter of my Book, and the certain ruin of yours, is ſo far from being, according to your pretence, deteſted by all *Proteſtants*, that all *Proteſtants* whatſoever, as you may ſee in their Harmony of Confeſſions, unanimouſly profeſs and maintain it. And you your ſelf, C. 6. § 30. plainly confeſs as much, in ſaying, *The whole Edifice of the Faith of* Proteſtants *is ſetled on theſe two Principles: Theſe particular Books are Canonical Scripture: And the ſenſe and meaning of them is plain and evident at leaſt in all points neceſſary to Salvation.*

38. And thus your Venom againſt me is in a manner ſpent, ſaving only that there remain two little impertinences, whereby you would diſable me from being a fit advocate for the cauſe of *Proteſtants*. The firſt, becauſe I refuſe to ſubſcribe the Artic. of the Ch. of *England*: The ſecond, becauſe I have ſet down in writing, motives which ſometime induced me to forſake Proteſtantiſm, and hitherto have not anſwered them.

39. By

39. By the former of which objections it ſhould ſeem, that either you conceive the 39 Articles the common Doctrine of all Proteſtants, and if they be, why have you ſo often upbraided them with their many and great differences? Or elſe that it is the peculiar defence of the Church of *England*, and not the common cauſe of all *Proteſtants*, which is here undertaken by me: which are certainly very groſs miſtakes. And yet, why he who makes ſcruple of ſubſcribing the truth of one or two Propoſitions, may not yet be fit enough to maintain, that thoſe who do ſubſcribe them, are in a ſaveable condition, I do not underſtand. Now though I hold not the Doctrine of all *Proteſtants* abſolutely true, (which with reaſon cannot be required of me while they hold contradictions,) yet I hold it free from all impiety, and from all Error deſtructive of Salvation, or in it ſelf damnable: And this I think in reaſon may ſufficiently qualifie me, for a maintainer of this aſſertion, that *Proteſtancy deſtroys not Salvation.* For the Church of *England*, I am perſuaded that the conſtant Doctrine of it is ſo pure and Orthodox, that whoſoever believes it and lives according to it, undoubtedly he ſhall be ſaved; and that there is no Error in it which may neceſſitate or warrant any Man to diſturb the peace or renounce the Communion of it. This in my opinion is all intended by Subſcription, and thus much if you conceive me not ready to ſubſcribe, your *Charity* I aſſure you is much *miſtaken.*

40. Your other Objection is yet more impertinent and frivolous than the former: Unleſs perhaps it be a juſt exception againſt a Phyſitian, that himſelf was ſometimes in, and recovered himſelf from that Diſeaſe which he undertakes to cure; or againſt a Guide in a way, that at firſt before he had experience, himſelf miſtook it, and afterwards found his error and amended it. That noble writer *Michael de Montaigne*, was ſurely of a far different mind; for he will hardly allow any Phyſitian competent, but only for ſuch Diſeaſes as himſelf had paſſed through: And a far greater than *Montaigne*, even he that ſaid, *Tu converſus confirma fratres, when thou art converted, ſtrengthen thy*

by Brethren, gives us ſufficiently to underſtand, that they which have themſelves been in ſuch a ſtate as to need Converſion, are not thereby made incapable of, but rather engaged and obliged unto, and qualified for this Charitable Function.

41. The Motives then, hitherto not anſwered, were theſe.

42. *I. Becauſe perpetual viſible profeſſion, which could never be wanting to the Religion of Chriſt, nor any part of it, is apparently wanting to* Proteſtant *Religion, ſo far as concerns the points in conteſtation.*

II. Becauſe Luther *and his followers, ſeparating from the Church of* Rome, *ſeparated alſo from all Churches, pure or impure, true or falſe then being in the world; upon which ground I conclude, that either Gods promiſes did fail of performance, if there were then no Church in the World, which held all things neceſſary, and nothing repugnant to Salvation; or elſe that* Luther *and his Sectaries, ſeparating from all Churches then in the World, and ſo from the true, if there were any true, were* damnable Schiſmaticks.

III. Becauſe, if any credit may be given to as credible records, as any are extant, the Doctrine of Catholicks hath been frequently confirmed; and the oppoſite Doctrine of Proteſtants, *confounded with ſupernatural and Divine Miracles.*

IV. Becauſe many points of Proteſtant *Doctrine, are the damned Opinions of Heretiçks, condemned by the Primitive Church.*

V. Becauſe the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament, *touching the Converſion of Kings and Nations to the true Religion of Chriſt, have been accompliſhed in and by the Catholick* Roman *Religion, and the Profeſſors of it; and not by* Proteſtant *Religion, and the Profeſſors of it.*

VI. Becauſe the Doctrine of the Church of Rome *is conformable, and the Doctrine of* Proteſtants *contrary, to the Doctrine of the Fathers of the Primitive Church, even by the Confeſſion of* Proteſtants *themſelves; I mean, thoſe Fathers, who lived within the compaſs of the firſt* 600. *years; to whom* Proteſtants *themſelves do very frequently, and very confidently appeal.*

VII. Becauſe the firſt pretended Reformers had neither extraordinary Commiſſion *from God, nor ordinary* Miſſion *from the Church, to Preach* Proteſtant Doctrine.

VIII. Becauſe Luther, *to Preach againſt the Maß (which contains the moſt material points now in controverſie) was perſuaded by reaſons ſuggeſted to him by the Devil himſelf, diſputing with him. So himſelf profeſſeth in his Book* de Miſſa Privata. *That all men might take heed of following him, who profeſſeth himſelf to follow the Devil.*

IX. Becauſe the Proteſtant *cauſe is now, and hath been from the beginning, maintained with groſſe falſifications, and Calumnies; whereof their prime Controverſie writers, are notoriouſly, and in high degree guilty.*

X. Becauſe by denying all humane Authority, either of Pope, *or Councils, or Church, to determine Controverſies of Faith, they have aboliſhed all poſſible means of ſuppreſſing Hereſie, or reſtoring Unity to the Church.*

Theſe are the Motives; now my Anſwers to them follow briefly and in order.

43. To the firſt: God hath neither drecreed nor foretold, that his true Doctrine ſhould *de facto* be alwaies viſibly profeſſed, without any mixture of falſhood.

To the ſecond: God hath neither decreed nor foretold, that there ſhall be alwaies a viſible Company of Men free from all Error in it ſelf Damnable. Neither is it alwaies of neceſſity Schiſmatical to ſeparate from the external Communion of a Church, though wanting nothing neceſſary: For if this Church ſuppoſed to want nothing neceſſary, require me to profeſs againſt my Conſcience, that I believe ſome Error, tho never ſo ſmall and innocent, which I do not believe, and will not allow me Her Communion, but upon this condition: In this caſe, the Church for requiring this condition is Schiſmatical, and not I for ſeparating from the Church.

To the third: If any credit may be given to Records far more creditable than theſe, the Doctrine of *Proteſtants*, that is, the Bible hath been confirmed, and the Doctrine of *Papiſts*, which is in many points plainly oppoſite to it, confounded with Supernatural and Divine Miracles, which for number and Glory, out-ſhine *Popiſh* pretended Miracles, as much as the Sun doth an *Ignis fatuus*, thoſe I mean which were wrought by our Saviour Chriſt and his Apoſtles,

ſtles: Now this Book, by the Confeſſion of all ſides confirmed by innumerous Miracles, foretels me plainly, that in after Ages, great Signs and Wonders ſhall be wrought in confirmation of falſe Doctrine, and that I am not to believe any Doctrine which ſeems to my underſtanding repugnant to the firſt, though an Angel from Heaven ſhould teach it; which were certainly as great a Miracle as any that was ever wrought in atteſtation of any part of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*: But that true Doctrine ſhould in all Ages have the teſtimony of Miracles, that I am no where taught; So that I have more reaſon to ſuſpect and be afraid of pretended Miracles, as ſigns of falſe Doctrine, then much to regard them as certain arguments of the truth. Beſides, ſetting aſide the Bible, and the Tradition of it, there is as good ſtory for Miracles wrought by thoſe who lived and died in oppoſition to the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, (as by *S. Cyprian*, *Colmannus*, *Columbanus*, *Aidanus* and others,) as there is for thoſe that are pretended to be wrought by the Members of that Church. Laſtly, it ſeems to me no ſtrange thing, that God in his Juſtice ſhould permit ſome true Miracles to be wrought to delude them, who have forged ſo many, as apparently the Profeſſors of the *Roman* Doctrine have to abuſe the World.

To the Fourth: All thoſe were not [a] Hereticks which by *Philaſtrius*, *Epiphanius*, or *S. Auſtine* were put in the Catalogue of Hereticks.

To the Fifth: Kings and Nations have been, and may be Converted by Men of contrary Religions.

To the Sixth: The Doctrine of *Papiſts*, is confeſſed by *Papiſts* contrary to the Fathers in many points.

To the Seventh: The Paſtors of a Church cannot but have Authority from it, to Preach againſt the abuſes of it, whether in Doctrine or Practice, if there be any in it: Neither can any Chriſtian want an ordinary commiſſion from God to do a neceſſary work of Charity after a peaceable manner, when there is no body elſe that can or will do it. In extraordinary caſes, extraordinary courſes are not to be diſallowed. If ſome Chriſtian Lay-man

[a] See this acknowledged by Bellar: *de Scrip: Eccleſ. in Philaſtrio*: by *Petavius Animad. in Epiph. de inſcrip. operis*: By S. Auſtin. *Lib. de Hæreſ. Hær.* 80.

ſhould come into a Country of Infidels, and had ability to perſuade them to Chriſtianity, who would ſay he might not uſe it for want of Commiſſion!

To the Eighth: *Luthers* conference with the Devil might be, for ought I know, nothing but a Melancholy Dream: If it were real, the Devil might perſuade *Luther* from the Maſs, hoping by doing ſo to keep him conſtant to it: Or that others would make his diſſuaſion from it an argument for it, (as we ſee *Papiſts* do) and be afraid of following *Luther*, as confeſſing himſelf to have been perſuaded by the Devil.

To the Ninth: *Illiacos intra muros peccatur & extra. Papiſts* are more guilty of this fault than *Proteſtants*. Even this very Author in this very Pamphlet, hath not ſo many leaves as falſifications and Calumnies.

To the Tenth: Let all Men believe the Scripture and that only, and endeavour to believe it in the true ſenſe, and require no more of others, and they ſhall find this not only a better, but the only means to ſuppreſs Hereſie, and reſtore Unity. For he that believes the Scripture ſincerely, and endeavours to believe it in the true ſenſe, cannot poſſibly be an Heretick: And if no more than this were required of any Man, to make him capable of the Churches Communion, then all Men ſo qualified, though they were different in opinion, yet notwithſtanding any ſuch difference, muſt be of neceſſity one in Communion.

THE

THE ANSWER TO THE PREFACE.

To the First, and Second. §. If beginnings be ominous (as they ſay they are,) D. *Potter* hath cauſe to look for great ſtore of uningenuous dealing from you; the very firſt words you ſpeak of him, *viz. That he hath not ſo much as once truly and really fallen upon the point in queſtion,* being a moſt unjuſt and immodeſt imputation.

2. For the point in queſtion was not that which you pretend, *Whether both* Papiſts *and* Proteſtants *can be ſaved in their ſeveral Profeſſions?* But, *whether you may without uncharitableneſs affirm that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroys Salvation?* For there is no incongruity but that it may be true, *That you and we connot both be Saved:* and yet as True, *That without uncharitableneſs you cannot pronounce us Damned.* And therefore though the Author of *Charity Miſtaken* had proved as ſtrongly as he hath done weakly, *that one Heaven could not receive* Proteſtants *and* Papiſts *both,* yet certainly, it was very haſtily and unwarrantably, and therefore uncharitably concluded, that *Proteſtants* were the part that was to be excluded. As, though Jews and Chriſtians cannot both be ſaved, yet a Jew cannot juſtly, and therefore not charitably pronounce a Chriſtian Damned.

3. Neither may you or C. *M.* conclude him from hence (as covertly you do,) *an Enemy to Souls by deceiving them with ungrounded falſe hopes of Salvation*; ſeeing the hope of Salvation cannot be ungrounded, which requires and ſuppoſes belief and practiſe of all things abſolutely neceſſary

to

to Salvation, and repentance of thoſe Sins and Errors which we fall into by humane frailty: Nor a *friend to indifferency in Religions*, ſeeing he gives them only hope of pardon of Errors who are deſirous, and according to the proportion of their opportunities and abilities induſtrious to find the truth, or at leaſt truly repentant, that they have not been ſo. Which Doctrine is very fit to excite men to a conſtant and impartial ſearch of truth, and very far from teaching them, that it is indifferent what Religion they are of, and without all controverſie very honourable to the goodneſs of God, with which how it can conſiſt, not to be ſatisfied with his Servants true endeavours to know his will and do it, without full and exact performance, I leave it to you and all good men to judge.

5. You ſay *he was loth to affirm plainly, that generally both* Catholicks *and* Proteſtants *may be ſaved:* which yet is manifeſt he doth affirm plainly, of *Proteſtants* throughout his Book; and of Erring *Papiſts*, that have *ſincerely ſought the truth and failed of it, and Die with a generalrepentance*: p. 77. 78. And yet you deceive your ſelf, if you conceive he had any other neceſſity to do ſo, but only that he thought it true. For we may and do pretend that before Luther *there were many true Churches, beſides the* Roman, which agreed not with her: in particular, *The Greek Church.* So that what you ſay is evidently true, is indeed evidently falſe. Beſides if he had had any neceſſity to make uſe of you in this matter, he needed not for this end to ſay that now in your Church, Salvation may be had; but onely that before *Luthers* time it might be: Then when your means of knowing the truth were not ſo great, and when your ignorance might be more invincible, and therefore more excuſable. So that you may ſee if you pleaſe, it is not for ends, but for the love of truth, that we are thus charitable to you.

6. Neither is it material what you alledge, that they are not *Fundamental Errors*, and then, *what imports it whether we hold them or no, foraſmuch as concerns our poſſibility to be Saved.* As if we were not bound by the Love of God and the love of truth, to be zealous in the defence of all Truths,

Truths, that are any way profitable, though not ſimply neceſſary to Salvation. Or as if any good man could ſatisfie his Conſcience with being ſo affected and reſolved. Our Saviour himſelf having aſſured us, * That *he that ſhall break one of his leaſt Commandments* (ſome whereof you pretend are concerning venial ſins, and conſequently the keeping of them not neceſſary to Salvation) *and ſhall ſo teach men, ſhall be called the leaſt in the Kingdom of Heaven.*

7. But then it imports very much, though not for the *poſſibility that you may be ſaved*, yet for the *probability that you will be ſo:* becauſe the holding of theſe Errors, though it did not *merit*, migh yet *occaſion* Damnation. As the Doctrine of Indulgences may take away the fear of Purgatory, and the Doctrine of Purgatory the fear of Hell; as you well know it does too frequently. So that though a godly man might be ſaved *with theſe* Errors, yet by *means of them*, many are made vicious and ſo damned. *By them* I ſay, though *not for them.* No godly Lay-man who is verily perſuaded that there is neither impiety nor ſuperſtition in the uſe of your Latin Service, ſhall be Damned, I hope, for being preſent at it; yet the want of that Devotion which the frequent hearing the Offices underſtood, might happily beget in them, the want of that inſtruction and edification which it might afford them, may very probably hinder the Salvation of many which otherwiſe might have been ſaved. Beſides, though the matter of an Error may be only ſomething profitable, not neceſſary, yet the neglect of it may be a damnable Sin. As not to regard Venial Sins is in the Doctrine of your Schools, mortal. Laſtly, as Venial Sins, you ſay, diſpoſe men to mortal; ſo the erring from ſome profitable, though leſſer truth, may diſpoſe a man to Error in greater matters. As for example: The Belief of the *Popes* Infallibility is, I hope, not unpardonably damnable to every one that holds it; yet if it be a falſhood (as moſt certainly it is) it puts a man into a very congruous diſpoſition to believe *Antichriſt*, if he ſhould chance to get into that See.

8. To

8. To the third §] *In his diſtinction of points Fundamental and not Fundamental, he may ſeem, you ſay, to have touched the point, but does not ſo indeed. Becauſe though he ſaies there are ſome points ſo Fundamental, as that all are obliged to believe them explicitely, yet he tells you not, whether a man may disbelieve any other points of Faith, which are ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding, as Truths revealed by Almighty God.* Touching this matter of *Sufficient Propoſal*, if you mean by *ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding as revealed by God*, that which, all things conſidered, is ſo propoſed to him, that he might and ſhould and would believe it to be true and revealed by God, were it not for ſome voluntary and avoidable fault of his that interpoſeth it ſelf between his underſtanding and the truth preſented to it: if you ſpeak of truths thus propoſed and rejected, let it be as damnable as you pleaſe to deny or disbelieve them. But it amazes me to hear you ſay, that Dr. *Potter* declines this Queſtion, ſeeing the Light it ſelf is not more clear, then Dr. *Potters* Declaration of himſelf (p. 245, 246. *&c.* of his Book) beginning his diſcourſe thus. "*It ſeems Fundamental to the Faith, and for the Salvation of* "*every member of the Church, that he acknowledge and believe* "*all ſuch points of Faith, as whereof he may be convinced that* "*they belong to the Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt.*

"To this conviction he requires three things. *Clear* "*Revelation; Sufficient Propoſition, and Capacity and under-* "*ſtanding in the hearer. For want of clear Revelation, he* "*frees the Church before Chriſt and the Diſciples of Chriſt* "*from any damnable Error, though they believed not thoſe* "*things which he that ſhould now deny were no Chriſtian. To* "*ſufficient Propoſition, he requires two things.* 1. *That the* "*points be perſpicuouſly laid open in themſelves.* 2. *So forci-* "*bly, as may ſerve to remove reaſonable doubts to the contra-* "*ry, and to ſatisfie a teachable mind concerning it, againſt the* "*Principles in which he hath been bred to the contrary. This* "*Propoſition he ſays is not limited to the* Pope *or* Church, *but* "*extended to all means whatſoever, by which a man may be* "*convinced in Conſcience, that the matter propoſed is Divine* "*Revelation; which he profeſſes to be done ſufficiently, not*

"*only*

" *only when his Conſcience doth expreſly bear witneſs to the* " *truth; but when it would do ſo, if it were not choaked, and* " *blinded by ſome unruly and unmortified luſt in the will. The* " *difference being not great between him that is wilfully blind,* " *and him that knowingly gainſaieth the Truth. The 3 thing* " *he requires is Capacity and Ability to apprehend the Propoſal,* " *and the Reaſons of it: the want whereof excuſeth Fools and* " *Madmen,* &c. *But where there is no ſuch impediment, and* " *the will of God is ſufficiently propounded, there* (ſaith he) *he* " *that oppoſeth is convinced of Error; and he who is thus* " *convinced is an Heretick: and Hereſie is a work of the* " *Fleſh, which excludeth from Salvation,* (he means without " Repentance,) *And hence it followeth, that it is Funda-* " *mental to a Chriſtians Faith, and neceſſary for his Salvati-* " *on, that he believe all revealed truths of God, whereof he* " *may be convinced that they are from God.*

Again, it is almoſt as ſtrange to me, why you ſhould ſay, this was the only thing in queſtion, *Whether a Man may deny or disbelieve any point of Faith, ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding as a truth revealed by God.* For to ſay, that any thing is a thing in queſtion, methinks at the firſt hearing of the words, imports, that it is by ſome affirmed, and denied by others. Now you affirm I grant, but what *Proteſtant* ever denied, that it was a ſin to give God the lie? Which is the firſt and moſt obvious ſenſe of theſe Words. Or which of them ever doubted, that to disbelieve is then a fault, when the matter is ſo propoſed to a Man, that he might and ſhould, and were it not for his own fault, would believe it? Certainly he that queſtions either of theſe, juſtly deſerves to have his wits called in queſtion. Produce any one *Proteſtant* that ever did ſo, and I will give you leave to ſay it is the only thing in queſtion. But then I muſt tell you, that your enſuing Argument, viz: *To deny a truth witneſſed by God is damnable, But of two that diſagree, one muſt of neceſſity deny ſome ſuch truth, Therefore one only can be ſaved*; is built upon a ground clean different from this poſtulate. For though it be always a fault to deny what either I do know, or ſhould know, to be teſtified by God; yet that which by a

cleanly conveyance you put in the place hereof, *To deny a Truth witneſſed by God* ſimply, without the circumſtance of *being known or ſufficiently propoſed*, is ſo far from being certainly Damnable, that it may be many times done without any the leaſt fault at all. As if God ſhould teſtifie ſomething to a man in the *Indies*, I that had no aſſurance of this teſtification ſhould not be obliged to believe it. For in ſuch caſes the Rule of the Law has place, *Idem eſt non eſſe & non apparere:* not to be at all and not to appear to me, is to me all one. *If I had not come and ſpoken unto you* (ſaith our Saviour) *you had had no ſin.*

10. As little neceſſity is there for that which follows: *That of two diſagreeing in a matter of Faith one muſt deny ſome ſuch truth.* Whether by [ſuch] you underſtand, *Teſtified at all by God*; or *teſtified and ſufficiently propounded.* For it is very poſſible the matter in controverſie may be ſuch a thing wherein God hath not at all declared himſelf, or not ſo fully and clearly as to oblige all Men to hold one way; and yet be ſo overvalued by the parties in variance, as to be eſteemed a matter *of Faith*, and one of thoſe things of which our Saviour ſays, *He that believeth not ſhall be Damned.* Who ſees not that it is poſſible two Churches may excommunicate and Damn each other for keeping *Chriſtmas* Ten days ſooner or later; as well as *Victor* excommunicated the Churches of *Aſia*, for differing from him about *Eaſter-Day*? And yet I believe you will confeſs, that God had not then declared himſelf about *Eaſter*; nor hath now about *Chriſtmas*. Anciently ſome good Catholick Biſhops excommunicated and Damned others for *holding there were Antipodes:* and in this queſtiom I would fain know on which ſide was the ſufficient propoſal. *The contra-Remonſtrants* differ from the *Remonſtrants* about the points of Predetermination as a matter of Faith: I would know in this thing alſo, which way God hath declared himſelf; whether for Predetermination or againſt it. *Stephen Biſhop of* Rome held it as a matter of Faith and Apoſtolick tradition, *That Hereticks gave true Baptiſm*: Others there were, and they as good Catholicks as he, that held that this was neither matter of *Faith* nor matter of *Truth*. *Juſtin Martyr*

and

and *Irenæus* held the Doctrine of the *Millenaries* as a matter of *Faith*: and though *Juſtin Martyr* deny it, yet you, I hope, will affirm, that ſome good Chriſtians held the contrary. S. *Auguſtine*, I am ſure, held *the communicating of Infants*, as much Apoſtolick tradition, as the Baptiſing of them: whether the Biſhop and the Church of *Rome* of his time, held ſo too, or held otherwiſe, I deſire you to determine. But, ſure I am, the Church of *Rome* at this preſent holds the contrary. The ſame S. *Auſtin* held it no matter of Faith, that the *Biſhops of* Rome *were Judges of Appeals* from all parts of the Church Catholick, no not in *Major Cauſes and Major Perſons*: whether the Biſhop or Church of *Rome* did then hold the contrary do you reſolve me; but now I am reſolved they do ſo. In all theſe differences, the point in queſtion is eſteemed and propoſed by one ſide at leaſt as a matter of *Faith*, and by the other rejected as not ſo: and either this is to diſagree in matters of Faith, or you will have no means to ſhew that we do diſagree. Now then to ſhew you how weak and ſandy the Foundation is, on which the whole Fabrick both of your Book and Church depends, anſwer me briefly to this *Dilemma*. Either in theſe oppoſitions one of the oppoſite Parts erred damnably, and denied Gods truth ſufficiently propounded or they did not. If they did, than they which do deny Gods truth ſufficiently propounded, may go to heaven; and then you are raſh and uncharitable in excluding us, though we were guilty of this fault. If not, then there is no ſuch neceſſity, that of two diſagreeing about a matter of Faith, one ſhould deny Gods truth ſufficiently propounded. And ſo the Major and Minor of your Argument, are proved falſe. Yet, though they were as true as Goſpel, and as evident as Mathematical Principles, the concluſion (ſo impertinent is it to the Premiſes) might ſtill be falſe. For that which naturally iſſues from theſe propoſitions is not *Therefore one only can be ſaved*: but, *Therefore one of them does ſomething that is damnable*. But with what Logick or what Charity you can infer either as the immediate production of the former premiſes, or as a Corollary from this concluſion, Therefore *one only can be ſaved*,

ved, I do not underſtand; unleſs you will pretend that this conſequence is good, ſuch a one doth ſomething damnable, therefore he ſhall certainly be damned: which whether it be not to overthrow the Article of our Faith, which promiſes remiſſion of ſins upon repentance, and conſequently to ruin the Goſpel of Chriſt, I leave it to the *Pope* and the *Cardinals* to determine. For if againſt this it be alledged, that no man can repent of the ſin wherein he Dies: This muce I have already ſtopped, by ſhewing that if it be a ſin of Ignorance, this is no way incongruous.

13. Ad 6. §.] In your ſixth *Parag.* I let all paſs ſaving only this, *That a perſuaſion that men of different Religions* (you muſt mean Chriſtians of different Opinions or Communions) *may be ſaved, is a moſt pernicious Hereſie, and even a ground of Atheiſm.* What ſtrange extractions Chymiſtry can make I know not; but ſure I am, he that by reaſon would infer this Concluſion, *That there is no God*; from this ground, *That God will ſave men in different Religions*, muſt have a higher ſtrain of Logick, than you for I have hitherto made ſhew of. In my apprehenſion, the other part of the contradiction, *That there is a God*, ſhould much rather follow from it; and I ſay and will maintain, that to ſay, *That Chriſtians of different Opinions and Communions* (*ſuch I mean, who hold all thoſe things that are ſimply neceſſary to Salvation*) *may not obtain Pardon for the Errors wherein they Die ignorantly, by a general Repentance*; *is ſo far from being a ground of* Atheiſm, *that to ſay the contrary, is to croſs in Diameter a main Article of our Creed, and to overthrow the Goſpel of Chriſt.*

14. Ad 7. §.] To what you ſay, of ſome *Proteſtants* that *hold it neceſſary to be able to prove a perpetual Viſible Church diſtinct from Yours.* I anſwer, Some perhaps [illegible] to do ſo, as a matter of courteſie; but I believe you will [illegible] much to ſeek for any one that holds it neceſſary. For though you ſay that Chriſt hath promiſed there ſhall be a Perpetual Viſible Church; yet you your ſelves do not pretend that he hath promiſed there ſhall be Hiſtories and Records always extant of the Profeſſors of it in

all

all Ages: nor that he hath any where enjoyned us to read thoſe Hiſtories that we may be able to ſhew them.

17. To your enſuing demands, though ſome of them be very captious and enſnaring; yet I will give you as clear and plain and Ingenuous Anſwers as poſſibly I can.

18. Ad 11. §.] To the Firſt then, about *the Perpetuity of the viſible Church*, my Anſwer is: That I believe our Saviour, ever ſince his Aſcenſion, hath had in ſome place or other a Viſible true Church on Earth: I mean a Company of Men, that profeſſed at leaſt ſo much truth as was abſolutely neceſſary for their Salvation. And I believe that there will be ſomewhere or other ſuch a Church to the Worlds end. But the contrary Doctrine I do at no hand believe to be a damnable Hereſie.

19. Ad 12. §.] To the Second, what *Viſible Church there was before* Luther *diſagreeing from the* Roman? I anſwer, that before *Luther* there were many Viſible Churches in many things diſagreeing from the *Roman*: But not that the whole Catholick Church diſagreed from Her, becauſe She her ſelf was a Part of the Whole, though much corrupted. And to undertake to name a Catholick Church diſagreeing from Her, is to make her no Part of it, which we do not, nor need not pretend. And *for men agreeing with* Proteſtants *in all points*, we will then produce them, when you ſhall either prove it neceſſary to be done, which you know we abſolutely deny; or when you ſhall produce a perpetual ſucceſſion of Profeſſors, which in all points have agreed with you, and diſagreed from you in nothing. But this my promiſe, to deal plainly with you, I conceive, and ſo intended it to be very like his, who undertook to drink up the Sea, upon condition, that he, to whom the promiſe was made, ſhould firſt ſtop the Rivers from runing in. For this unreaſonable requeſt which you make to us is to your ſelves ſo impoſſible, that in the very next Age after the Apoſtles, you will never be able to name a Man, whom you can prove to have agreed with you in all things, nay (if you ſpeak of ſuch, whoſe Works are extant and unqueſtioned) whom we cannot prove to have diſagreed from

you.

you in many things. Which I am so certain of, that I will venture my Credit, and my Life upon it.

20. Ad 13. §.] To the Third, *Whether, seeing there cannot be assigned any Visible true Church distinct from the* Roman, *it follows not that She Erred not Fundamentally.* I say, in our sense of the word *Fundamental*, it does follow. For if it be true, that there was then no Church distinct from the *Roman*, then it must be, either because there was no Church at all, which we deny: Or because the *Roman* Church was the whole Church, which we also deny: Or because She was a Part of the Whole, which we grant. And if She were a true Part of the Church than She retained those truths which were simply necessary to Salvation, and held no Errors which were inevitably and unpardonably destructive of it. For this is precisely necessary to constitute any man or any Church a member of the Church Catholick. In our sense therefore of the Word *Fundamental*, I hope She erred not Fundamentally: but in your sense of the word, I fear she did. That is, She held something to be Divine Revelation, which was not; something not to be which was.

21. Ad 14. §.] To the Fourth. *How it could be damnable to maintain her Errors, if they were not Fundamental?* I answer. 1. Though it were not damnable, yet if it were a fault, it was not to be done. For a Venial sin, with you is not damnable; yet you say, it is not to be committed for the procuring any good. *Non est faciendum malum vel minimum, ut eveniat bonum vel maximum.* 2. It is damnable to maintain an error against Conscience, though the error in it self, and to him that believes it, be not damnable. Nay, the profession not only of an error, but even of a truth, if not believed, when you think on it again, I believe you will confess to be a mortal sin; unless you will say, Hypocrisie and Simulation in Religion is not so. 3. Though we say, the Errors of the *Roman* Church were not destructive of Salvation, but pardonable even to them that Dyed in them, upon a general repentance: yet we deny not but in *themselves they were damnable.* Nay, the very saying they were pardonable, implie

implies they needed pardon, and therefore in themſelves were damnable: damnable *meritoriouſly*, though not *effectually*. As a poyſon may be deadly in it ſelf, and yet not kill him, that together with the Poyſon takes an Antidote: or as Fellony may deſerve Death, and yet not bring it on him that obtains the Kings Pardon.

22. Ad 15. §] To the Fifth. *How they can be excuſed from Schiſm, who forſook her Communion upon pretence of Errors which were not damnable*! I anſwer. All that we forſake in you, is only the Belief, and Practice, and profeſſion of your Errors. Hereupon, you caſt us out of your Communion. And then with a ſtrange, and contradictious and ridiculous Hypocriſie, complain that we forſake it. As if a man ſhould thruſt his friend out of doors, and then be offended at his departure. But for us not to forſake the belief of your Errors, having diſcovered them to be Errors, was impoſſible; and therefore to do ſo could not be damnable, believing them to be Errors. Not to forſake the practice and profeſſion of them, had been damnable Hereſie; ſuppoſing that (which you vainly run away with, and take for granted) thoſe Errors in themſelves were not damnable. Now to do ſo, and as matters now ſtand, not to forſake your Communion, is apparently contradictious: ſeeing the condition of your Communion is, that we muſt profeſs to believe all your Doctrines, not only not to be damnable Errors (which will not content you,) but alſo to be certain and neceſſary and revealed truths. So that to demand why we forſake your Communion upon pretence of Errors which were not damnable, is in effect to demand why we forſook it upon our forſaking it! For to pretend that there are Errors in your Church though not damnable, is *ipſo facto* to forſake your Communion, and to do that which both in your account, and as you think in Gods account, puts him as does ſo, out of your Communion. So that either you muſt free your Church from requiring the belief of any Error whatſoever, damnable and not damnable, or whether you will or no, you muſt free us from Schiſm. For Schiſm there cannot be in

leaving

leaving your Communion, unleſs we were obliged to continue in it. Man cannot be obliged by Man, but to what either formally or virtually he is obliged by God, for all juſt power is from God. God the Eternal truth neither can nor will oblige us to believe any the leaſt and the moſt innocent falſhood to be a Divine truth, that is, to Err; nor, to profeſs a known Error, which is to lie. So that if you require the belief of any Error among the conditions of your Communion, our obligation to communicate with you ceaſeth, and ſo the imputation of Schiſm to us, vaniſheth into nothing: but lies heavy upon you for making our ſeparation from you juſt and neceſſary, by requiring unneceſſary and unlawful conditions of your Communion. Hereafter therefore, I intreat you, let not your demand be, how could we forſake your Communion without Schiſm, ſeeing you Erred not damnably? But how we could do ſo without Schiſm, ſeeing you Erred not at all? which if either you do prove, or we cannot diſprove it, we will (I at leaſt will for my part) return to your Communion, or ſubſcribe my ſelf Schiſmatick. In the mean time, μένομεν ὥσπερ ἐσμέν, we continue where we are.

23. Yet notwithſtanding all your Errors we do not renounce your Communion *totally* and abſolutely, but only leave Communicating with you in the practice and profeſſion of your Errors. The tryal whereof will be to propoſe ſome form of worſhiping God, taken wholly out of Scripture; and herein if we refuſe to joyn with you, then, and not till then, may we juſtly ſay we have utterly and abſolutely abandoned your Communion.

25. Ad 17. §.] To the Seventh, *Whether Error againſt any one truth ſufficiently propounded as teſtified by God, deſtroy not the Nature and Unity of Faith, or at leaſt, is not a grievous offence excluding Salvation*! I anſwer, if you ſuppoſe, as you ſeem to do the propoſition ſo ſufficient, that the party to whom it is made is convinced that it is from God, ſo that the denyal of it involves alſo with it the denial of Gods veracity; any ſuch Error deſtroys both Faith and Salvation. But if the Propoſal be only ſo ſufficient,

ſufficient, not, that the party to whom it is made is convinced, but only that he ſhould, and but for his own fault would have been convinced of the Divine verity of the Doctrine propoſed: The crime then is not ſo great, for the belief of Gods veracity may well conſiſt with ſuch an Error. Yet a fault I confeſs it is and (without Repentance) damnable, if all circumſtances conſidered the propoſal be ſufficient. But then I muſt tell you that the propoſal of the preſent *Roman* Church is only pretended to be ſufficient for this purpoſe, but is not ſo: eſpecially all the Rayes of the Divinity, which they pretend to ſhine ſo conſpicuouſly in her propoſals, being ſo darkned and even extinguiſhed with a cloud of contradiction, from Scripture, Reaſon, and the Ancient Church.

26. Ad 18. §.] To the Eighth. *How of diſagreeing* Proteſtants, *both parts may hope for Salvation, ſeeing ſome of them muſt needs Err againſt ſome Truth teſtified by God?* I anſwer, 1. The moſt diſagreeing *Proteſtants* that are, yet thus far agree, that theſe Books of Scripture which were never doubted of in the Church, are the undoubted Word of God, and a perfect rule of Faith. 2. That the ſenſe of them, which God intended, whatſoever it is, is certainly true. So that they believe implicitely even thoſe very truths againſt which they Err; and why an implicit Faith in Chriſt and his Word, ſhould not ſuffice as well as an implicit Faith in your Church, I have deſired to be reſolved by many of your Side, but never could.

3. That they are to uſe their beſt endeavours to believe the Scripture in the true ſenſe and to live according to it. This if they perform (as I hope many on all Sides do) truly and ſincerely, it is impoſſible but that they ſhould believe aright in all things neceſſary to Salvation: that is, in all thoſe things which appertain to the Covenant between God and man in Chriſt, for ſo much, is not only plainly but frequently contained in Scripture. And believing aright touching the Covenant, if they for their parts perform the condition required of them, which is ſincere obedience, why ſhould they not expect that God will perform his promiſe and give them Salvation?

For, as for other things which lie without the Covenant, and are therefore leſs neceſſary, if by reaſon of the ſeeming conflict which is oftentimes between Scripture and Reaſon, and Authority on the one ſide, and Scripture, Reaſon, and Authority on the other; if by reaſon of the variety of tempers, Abilities, Educations, and unavoidable prejudices, whereby mens underſtandings are variouſly formed and faſhioned, they do embrace ſeveral Opinions, whereof ſome muſt be erroneous; to ſay that God will Damn them for ſuch Errors, who are lovers of him, and lovers of truth, is to rob man of his comfort, and God of his goodneſs; it is to make Man deſperate and God a Tyrant. *But they deny Truths teſtified by God, and therefore ſhall be Damned.* Yes, if they knew them to be thus teſtified by him, and yet would deny them, that were to give God the lie, and queſtionleſs damnable. But if you ſhould deny a truth which God had teſtified but only to a Man in the *Indies*, (as I ſaid before) and this teſtification you had never heard of, or at leaſt had no ſufficient reaſon to believe that God had ſo teſtified, would not you think it a hard caſe to be Damned for ſuch a denial? Yet conſider I pray a little more attentively the difference between them, and you will preſently acknowledge, the queſtion between them is not at any time, or in any thing, Whether God ſays true or no? or whether he ſays this or no? But ſuppoſing he ſays this, and ſays true, whether he means this or no? As for example, between *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*, and *Zwinglians*, it is agreed that Chriſt ſpake theſe Words, *This is my Body*; and that whatſoever he meant in ſaying ſo is true: But what he meant and how he is to be underſtood, that's the queſtion. So that though ſome of them deny a truth by God intended, yet you can with no reaſon or juſtice accuſe them of denying the truth of Gods Teſtimony, unleſs you can plainly ſhew that God hath declared, and that plainly and clearly, what was his meaning in theſe Words. I ſay *plainly and clearly*. For he that ſpeaks obſcurely and ambiguouſly, and no where declares himſelf plainly, ſure he hath no reaſon to be much offended if he be miſtaken. When therefore you can ſhew, that

in

in this and all other their Controverſies, God hath interpoſed his Teſtimony on one ſide or other; ſo that either they do ſee it, and will not; or were it not for their own voluntary and avoidable fault, might and ſhould ſee it and do not; let all ſuch Errors be as damnable as you pleaſe to make them. In the mean while, if they ſuffer themſelves neither to be betraid into their Errors, nor kept in them by any ſin of their will; if they do their beſt endeavour to free themſelves from all Errors, and yet fail of it through humane frailty; ſo well am I perſuaded of the goodneſs of God, that if in me alone, ſhould meet a confluence of all ſuch Errors of all the *Proteſtants* in the World, that were thus qualified, I ſhould not be ſo much afraid of them all, as I ſhould be to ask pardon for them. For, whereas that which you affright us with of calling Gods Veracity in Queſtion, is but a Panick fear, a fault that no man thus qualified, is, or can be guilty of; to ask pardon of ſimple and purely involuntary errors is tacitely to imply that God is angry with us for them, and that to impute to him the ſtrange Tyranny of *requiring Brick, when he gives no Straw*; *of expecting to gather, where he ſtrewed not*; *to reap where he ſowed not*: of being offended with us for not doing what he knows we cannot do. This I ſay upon a ſuppoſition, that they do their beſt endeavours to know Gods will and do it; which he that denys to be poſſible, knows not what he ſays; for he ſays in effect, that Men cannot do, what they can do; for to do what a Man can do, is to do his beſt endeavour. But becauſe this ſuppoſition, though certainly poſſible, is very rare, and admirable, I ſay ſecondly, that I am verily perſuaded, that God will not impute Errors to them, as ſins, who uſe ſuch a meaſure of induſtry, in finding truth, as humane *prudence* and ordinary *diſcretion* (their abilities and opportunities, their diſtractions and hindrances, and all other things conſidered) ſhall adviſe them unto, in a matter of ſuch conſequence. But if herein alſo we fail, then our Errors begin to be malignant, and juſtly imputable, as offences againſt God, and that love of his truth which he requires

in us. You will ſay then, that for thoſe Erring *Proteſtants*, which are in this caſe, which evidently are far the greater part, they ſin damnably in Erring, and therefore there is little hope of their Salvation. To which I anſwer, that the conſequence of this Reaſon, is ſomewhat ſtrong againſt a *Proteſtant*; but much weakned by coming out of the Mouth of a *Papiſt*. For all Sins with you are not damnable. But yet out of courteſie to you, we will remove this rubb out of your way; and for the preſent ſuppoſe them *mortal Sins*; and is there then no hope of Salvation, for him that commits them? Not, you will ſay, if he Die in them without repentance; and ſuch *Proteſtants* you ſpeak of, *who without Repentance Die in their Errors*. Yea but what if they Die in their Errors with Repentance? than I hope you will have Charity enough to think they may be ſaved. *Charity Miſt.* takes it indeed for granted, that this ſuppoſition is diſtructive of it ſelf; and that it is impoſſible, and incongruous, that a Man ſhould repent of thoſe Errors wherein he Dies; or Die in thoſe whereof he repents. But it was wiſely done of Him to take it for granted; for moſt certainly He could not have ſpoken one word of ſenſe for the confirmation of it. For ſeeing *Proteſtants* believe, as well as you, Gods infinite and moſt admirable perfections in himſelf, more than moſt worthy of all poſſible love: ſeeing they believe, as well as you, his infinite goodneſs to them, in Creating them of nothing; in Creating them according to his own Image; in Creating all things for their uſe and benefit; in ſtreaming down his Favours on them every moment of their Lives; in deſigning them, if they ſerve him, to infinite and Eternal Happineſs; in Redeeming them, not with corruptible things, but the Pretious Blood of his beloved Son: ſeeing they believe, as well as you, His infinite goodneſs, and Patience towards them, in expecting their Converſion; in Wooing, Alluring, Leading, and by all means, which his Wiſdom can Suggeſt unto him, and Mans nature is capable of, drawing them to Repentance and Salvation: Seeing they believe theſe things as well as you, and for ought you know,

In the place above quoted.

know, conſider them as much as you, (and if they do not, it is not their Religion, but they that are to blame,) what can hinder, but that the conſideration of Gods moſt infinite goodneſs to them, and their own almoſt infinite wickedneſs againſt him, Gods Spirit cooperating with them, may raiſe them to a true and ſincere and a cordial love of God? And ſeeing ſorrow for having injured or offended the Perſon beloved, or when we fear we may have offended him, is the moſt natural effect of true love; what can hinder, but that love which hath oftimes conſtrained them, to lay down their lives for God (which our Saviour aſſures us is the nobleſt Sacrifice we can offer,) may produce in them an univerſal ſorrow for all their ſins, both which they know they have committed, and which they fear they may have? In which number, their being negligent, or not diſpaſſionate, or not unprejudicate enough in ſeeking the truth, and the effect thereof, their Errors, if they be ſins, cannot but be compriz'd. In a word, what ſhould hinder, but that, that Prayer---- *Delicta ſua quis intelligit? who can underſtand his faults? Lord cleanſe thou me from my ſecret ſins,* may be heard and accepted by God, as well from a *Proteſtant* that Dies in ſome Errors, as from a *Papiſt* that Dies in ſome other ſins of Ignorance, which perhaps he might more eaſily have diſcovered to be ſins, than a *Proteſtant* could his Errors to be Errors? As well from a *Proteſtant*, that held ſome Error, which (as he conceived) Gods Word and his Reaſon, (which is alſo in ſome ſort Gods Word) led him unto; as from a *Dominican*, who perhaps took up his opinion upon truſt, not becauſe he had reaſon to believe it true, but becauſe it was the opinion of his *Order*; for the ſame man if he had light upon another Order, would in all probability, have been of the other Opinion. For what elſe is the cauſe, that generally *all the Dominicans are of one Opinion, and all the Jeſuits of the other?* I ſay, from a *Dominican* who took up his Opinion upon truſt; and that ſuch an Opinion (if we believe the writers of your Order) as if it be granted true, it were not a point matter, what Opinions any man held, or what actions

any

any man did, for the beſt would be as bad as the worſt, and the worſt as good as the beſt. And yet ſuch is the partiality of your Hypocriſie, that of diſagreeing *Papiſts*, neither ſhall deny the truth teſtified by God, but both may hope for Salvation: but of diſagreeing *Proteſtants* (though they differ in the ſame thing,) one ſide muſt deny Gods Teſtimony and be incapable of Salvation. That a *Dominican* through culpable negligence, living and dying in his Error, may repent of it, though he knows it not; or be ſaved though he do not: But if a *Proteſtant* do the very ſame thing, in the very ſame point, and Die in his Error, his caſe is deſperate. The Sum of all that hath been ſaid to this Demand is this. 1. That no Erring *Proteſtant* denys any truth teſtified by God, under this formality, *as teſtified by him*; nor which they know or believe to be teſtified by him. And therefore it is a horrible Calumny in you to ſay, *They call Gods Veracity in queſtion.* For Gods undoubted and unqueſtioned Veracity, is to them the ground, why they hold all they do hold: neither do they hold any Opinion ſo ſtifly, but they will forgoe it rather than this one, *That all which God ſays is true.* 2. God hath not ſo clearly and plainly declared himſelf in moſt of theſe things which are in controverſie between *Proteſtants*, but that an honeſt man, whoſe heart is right to God, and one that is a true lover of God, and of his truth, may by reaſon of the conflict of contrary Reaſons on both ſides, very eaſily, and therefore excuſably miſtake, and embrace Error for Truth, and reject Truth for Error. 3. If any *Proteſtant* or *Papiſt* be betrayed into, or kept in any Error, by any ſin of his will (as it is to be feared many Millions are) ſuch Error is, as the cauſe of it, ſinful and damnable: yet not excluſive of all hope of Salvation, but pardonable if diſcovered, upon a particular explicite repentance; if not diſcovered, upon a general and implicite repentance for all Sins known and unknown: in which number all ſinful Errors muſt of neceſſity be contained.

27. Ad 19. §.] To the Ninth. Wherein you are ſo urgent for a *particular Catalogue of Fundamentals*: I anſwer

ſwer almoſt in your own words, that we alſo conſtantly urge and require to have a particular Catalogue of your Fundamentals, whether they be written Verities, or unwritten Traditions, or Church Definitions? all which, you ſay integrate the material Object of your Faith: In a word of all ſuch Points as are defined and ſufficiently propoſed; ſo that whoſoever denys, or doubts of any of them, is certainly in the ſtate of damnation. A Catalogue I ſay in particular of the Propoſals: and not only ſome general definition, or deſcription, under which you lurk deceitfully, of what, and what only is ſufficiently propoſed: wherein yet you do not very well agree. For many of you hold the *Popes* Propoſal *Ex Cathedra*, to be ſufficient and obliging: Some a Council without a *Pope*: Some, of neither of them ſeverally, but only both together: Some not this neither in matter of manners, which *Bellarmine* acknowledges, and tells us it is all one in effect, as if they denyed it ſufficient in matter of Faith: Some not in matter of Faith, neither think this Propoſal Infallible, without the acceptation of the Church Univerſal: Some deny the Infallibility of the Preſent Church, and only make the Tradition of all Ages the *Infallible Propounder*. Yet if you were agreed *what and what only is the Infallible Propounder*, this would not ſatisfie us; nor yet to ſay, *that All is Fundamental which is propounded ſufficiently by him*. For though agreeing in this, yet you might ſtill diſagree *whether ſuch or ſuch a Doctrine were propounded or not: or if propounded, whether ſufficiently, or only inſufficiently*. And it is ſo known a thing, that in many points you do ſo, that I aſſure my ſelf you will not deny it. Therefore we conſtantly urge and require a particular and perfect Inventory of all theſe Divine Revelations, which you ſay *are ſufficiently propounded, and that ſuch a one to which all of your Church will ſubſcribe as neither redundant, nor deficient*; which when you give in with one hand, you ſhall receive a particular Catalogue of ſuch Points as I call *Fundamental* with the other. Neither may you think me unreaſonable in this demand, ſeeing upon ſuch a particular Catalogue of your ſufficient Propoſals

This great diverſity of Opinions among you, touching this matter, if any man doubt of it, let him read *Franciſcus Picus Mirandula in l. Theorem. in Expoſit. Theor. quarti.* and *Tho. Waldenſis. Tom.* 3. *De Sacramentalibus. doct.* 3. *fol.* 5. and he ſhall be fully ſatisfied that I have done you no injury.

as much depends, as upon a particular Catalogue of our *Fundamentals.* As for example. Whether or no a man do not Err in ſome point defined and ſufficiently propoſed: and whether or no thoſe that differ among you, differ in *Fundamentals*; which if they do *One Heaven* (by your own Rule) *cannot receive them All.* Perhaps you will here complain, that this is not to ſatisfie your demand, but to avoid it, and to put you off as the *Areopagites* did hard Cauſes *ad diem longiſſimum,* and bid you come again a Hundred Years hence: To deal truly, I did ſo intend it ſhould be. Neither can you ſay, my dealing with you is injurious, ſeeing I require nothing of you, but that, what you require of others, you ſhould ſhew it poſſible to be done, and juſt and neceſſary to be required. For, for my part, I have great reaſon to ſuſpect, it is neither the one nor the other. For whereas the Verities which are delivered in Scripture, may be very fitly divided into *ſuch as were written becauſe they were neceſſary to be believed,* Of which rank are thoſe only which conſtitute and make up the Covenant between God and Man in Chriſt: and then *ſuch as are neceſſary to be believed not in themſelves but only by accident, becauſe they were written.* Of which rank are many matters of Hiſtory, of Prophecy, of Myſtery, of Policy, of Oeconomy, and ſuch like, which are evidently not *intrinſecal* to the Covenant. Now to ſever exactly and punctally theſe Verities one from the other: what is *neceſſary in it ſelf* and antecedently to the writing, from what is but only profitable in it ſelf, and *neceſſary only becauſe written,* is a buſineſs of extream great difficulty, and extream little neceſſity. For firſt he that will go about to diſtinguiſh eſpecially in the ſtory of our Saviour, what was written becauſe it was *profitable,* from what was written becauſe *neceſſary,* ſhall find an intricate peice of buſineſs of it, and almoſt impoſſible that he ſhould be certain he hath done it, when he hath done it. And then it is apparently unneceſſary to go about it, ſeeing he that believes all, certainly believes all that is neceſſary. And he that doth not believe all (I mean all the undoubted parts of the undoubted Books of Scripture) can hardly believe

believe any, neither have we reaſon to believe he doth ſo. So that, that *Proteſtants* give you not a Catalogue of *Fundamentals*, it is not from Tergiverſation (as you ſuſpect, who for want of Charity to them always ſuſpect the worſt,) but from Wiſdom and Neceſſity. For they may very eaſily Err in doing it; becauſe though all which is neceſſary be plain in Scripture, yet all which is plain is not therefore written becauſe it was neceſſary. For what greater neceſſity was there that I ſhould know S. *Paul left his Cloak at* Troas, than thoſe *Worlds of Miracles*, which our Saviour did, which were never written. And when they had done it, it had been to no purpoſe; There being as matters now ſtand, as great neceſſity, of believing thoſe truths of Scripture, which are not Fundamental, as thoſe that are. You ſee then what reaſon we have to decline this hard labour, which you a rigid Task-maſter have here put upon us. Yet inſtead of giving you a Catalogue of Fundamentals, with which I dare ſay you are reſolved before it come, never to be ſatisfied, I will ſay that to you, which if you pleaſe may do you as much ſervice; and this it is. That it is ſufficient for any Mans Salvation that he believe the Scripture: That he endeavour to believe it in the true ſenſe of it, as far as concerns his Duty: And that he conform his Life unto it either by Obedience or Repentance. He that does ſo (and all *Proteſtants* according to the *Dictamen* of their Religion ſhould do ſo,) may be ſecure that he cannot Err Fundamentally. And they that do ſo cannot differ in Fundamentals. So that notwithſtanding their differences, and your preſumption, *the ſame Heaven may receive them All.*

28. Ad 20. §.] Your Tenth and laſt requeſt is, *to know diſtinctly what is the Doctrine of the* Proteſtant *Engliſh Church, in theſe points; and what my private Opinion.* Which ſhall be ſatisfied when the Church of *England* hath expreſſed her ſelf in them; or when you have told us what is the Doctrine of your Church, in the Queſtion of *Predetermination*, or the *Immaculate Conception.*

29. Ad 21. and 22. §.] Theſe anſwers I hope in the judgment of indifferent men are ſatisfactory to your Queſtions though not to you, For I have either anſwered them, or given you a reaſon why I have not. Neither, for ought I can ſee, *have I ſlitted from things conſidered in their own nature, to accidental or rare Circumſtances,* But told you my Opinion plainly what I thought of your Errors in themſelves: and what as they were qualified or malignified with good or bad Circumſtances.

CHAP. I.

The ANSWER to the Firſt CHAPTER.

Shewing that the Adverſary grants the Old Queſtion and propoſeth a New one. And that there is no reaſon, why among Men of different Opinions and Communions, one Side only can be ſaved.

1. AD 1. §.] *Proteſtants* are here accuſed of uncharitableneſs while they accuſe you of it: and you make good this charge in this manner. Proteſtants *charge the* Roman *Church with many and great Errors, judge reconciliation of their Doctrine and ours impoſſible, and that for them who are convicted in Conſcience of her Errors, not to forſake her in them, or to be reconciled unto her, is damnable. Therefore if* Roman Catholicks *be convicted in Conſcience of the Errors of* Proteſtants, *they may and muſt judge a reconciliation with them damnable, and conſequently, to judge ſo is no more uncharitable in them, than it is in* Proteſtants *to judge as they do.*

CHIL. All this I grant; nor would any *Proteſtant* accuſe you of *want of Charity* if you went no further. If you be perſwaded in Conſcience that our Religion is erroneous, the profeſſion of it, though in it ſelf moſt true, to you would be damnable. For it is no uncharitableneſs to judge *Hypocriſie a damnable Sin.* Let Hypocrite then and Diſſemblers on both Sides paſs. It is not towards

towards them, but good Chriſtians; not to *Proteſtant* Profeſſors but Believers that we require your Charity. What think you of thoſe that believe ſo verily the truth of our Religion, that they are reſolved to Die in it, and if occaſion were to Die for it? What Charity have you for them? What think you of thoſe that in the Days of our Fathers, laid down their Lives for it? are you content that they ſhall be ſaved, or do you hope they may be ſo? Will you grant that notwithſtanding their Errors, there is good hope they might Die with Repentance? and if they did ſo, certainly they are ſaved. If you will do ſo, this Controverſie is ended. No man will hereafter charge you with *want of Charity*. This is as much as either we give you, or expect of you, while you remain in your Religion. But then you muſt leave abuſing ſilly People, with telling them (as your faſhion is) that *Proteſtants confeſs* Papiſts *may be ſaved, but* Papiſts *confeſs not ſo much of* Proteſtants; *therefore yours is the ſafer way, and in Wiſdom and Charity to our own Souls we are bound to follow it.* For granting this, you grant as much hope of Salvation to *Proteſtants*, as *Proteſtants* do to you. If you will not, but ſtill affirm, as C. *M.* does, that *Proteſtants* (not diſſemblers but *believers*) *without a particular Repentance of their Religion cannot be ſaved:* This I ſay, is a *want of Charity*.

But I pray Sir what dependance is there between theſe Propoſitions: We that hold *Proteſtant* Religion falſe ſhould be damned if we ſhould profeſs it, Therefore they alſo ſhall be damned, that hold it true? Juſt as if you ſhould conclude, *Becauſe he that doubts is Damned if he Eat*, Therefore he that does not doubt is damned alſo if he Eat. And therefore though your Religion to us, or ours to you, if profeſſed againſt Conſcience would be damnable; yet may it well be uncharitable to define it ſhall be ſo, to them that profeſs either this or that according to Conſcience.

3. Ad 3. 4. 5. 6. §.] C. M. *Our meaning is not, that we give* Proteſtants *over to reprobation; that we offer no Prayers in hope of their Salvation; that we hold their Caſe deſperate. God forbid*, &c.

CHIL. I wiſh with all my Heart that you had expreſſed your ſelf in this matter more fully and plainly. Yet that which you ſay, doth plainly enough afford us theſe Corollaries. 1. That whatſoever *Proteſtant* wanteth Capacity, or having it, wanteth ſufficient means of inſtruction to convince his Conſcience of the falſhood of his own, and the truth of the *Roman* Religion, by the confeſſion of his moſt rigid Adverſaries, may be ſaved, notwithſtanding any Error in his Religion. 2. That nothing hinders but that a *Proteſtant* Dying a *Proteſtant* may Die with contrition for all his Sins. 3. That if he Die with Contrition, he may and ſhall be ſaved.

4. All theſe acknowledgments we have from you, while you are, as you ſay, ſtating, but, as I conceive granting the very point in queſtion. So that according to your Doctrine, the heavy ſentence ſhall remain upon *ſuch only, as either were, or but for their own fault, might have been ſufficiently convinced of the truth of your Religion, and the falſhood of their own, and yet Die in it without contrition.* Which Doctrine if you would ſtand to, and not pull down, and pull back with one hand, what you give and build with the other, this controverſie were ended; and I ſhould willingly acknowledge, that which follows in your fourth paragraph; *That you allow* Proteſtants *as much Charity as* D. Potter *allows you.* But then I muſt intreat you to alter the *argument of this Chapter*, and not to go about to give us reaſons, *why amongſt Men of different Religions, one ſide only can be ſaved abſolutely*, which your Reaſons drive at: But you muſt temper the crudeneſs of your Aſſertion by ſaying, *One Side only can be ſaved, unleſs want of Conviction, or elſe Repentance excuſe the other.* Beſides you muſt not only abſtain from damning any *Proteſtant* in particular, but from affirming in general, that Proteſtants *Dying in their Religion cannot be ſaved*; for you muſt always remember to add this caution, unleſs *they were excuſably ignorant of the falſhood of it, or Died with contrition.* And then conſidering that you cannot know, whether or no, all things conſidered, they were convinced ſufficiently of the truth of your Religion and the

falſhood

falſhood of their own, you are obliged by Charity to judge the beſt, and hope they are not. Conſidering again, that notwithſtanding their Errors, they may Die with contrition, and that it is no way improbable that they do ſo, and the contrary you cannot be certain of, You are bound in Charity to judge and hope they do ſo. Conſidering thirdly and laſtly, that if they Die not with *Contrition*, yet it is very probable they may Die with *Attrition*, and that this pretence of yours, that *Contrition will ſerve without actual Confeſſion, but Attrition will not*, is but a Nicety or Phanſie, or rather to give it the true name, a Device of your own, to ſerve ends and purpoſes; (God having no where declared himſelf, but that whereſoever he will accept of that Repentance, which you are pleaſed to call *Contrition*, he will accept of that which you call *Attrition*; For though he like beſt the bright Flaming Holocauſt of Love, yet he rejects not, he quenches not the ſmoaking Flax of that Repentance (if it be true and effectual) which proceeds from hope and fear:) Theſe things I ſay, conſidered, (unleſs you will have the Charity of your Doctrine riſe up in judgment againſt your uncharitable Practice) you muſt not only not be peremptory, in damning *Proteſtants*, but you muſt hope well of their Salvation: and out of this hope, you muſt do for them as well as others, thoſe, as you conceive, Charitable offices, of Praying, giving Alms and offering Sacrifice, which uſually you do, for thoſe of whoſe Salvation you are well and Charitably perſuaded; (for I believe you will never conceive ſo well of Proteſtants, as to aſſure your ſelves they go directly to Heaven.) Theſe things when you do I ſhall believe you think as Charitably as you ſpeak. But until then, as he ſaid in the Comedy, *Quid verba audiam cum facta videam?* ſo may I ſay to you, *Quid verba audiam cum facta non videam?* To what purpoſe ſhould you give us Charitable Words, which preſently you retract again, by denying us your Charitable Actions. And as theſe things you muſt do, if you will ſtand to and make good this pretended Charity, ſo muſt I tell you again and again, that one thing

you

you muſt not doe; I mean you muſt not affright poor People out of their Religion, with telling them, that *by the Confeſſion of both ſides, your way is ſafe, but in your judgment, ours undoubtedly damnable.* Seeing neither you deny Salvation to *Proteſtants Dying with repentance,* nor we promiſe it to you, *if ye Die without it.* For to deal plainly with you, I know no *Proteſtant* that hath any other hope of your Salvation, but upon theſe grounds, that *unaffected ignorance* may excuſe you, or *true repentance* obtain pardon for you; neither do the heavy cenſures which *Proteſtants* (you ſay) paſs upon your Errors, any way hinder but they may hope as well of you, upon repentance, as I do. For the *fierce Doctrine,* which, God knows who, teaches, that *Chriſt for many Ages before* Luther *had no viſible Church upon Earth*; will be mild enough, if you conceive them to mean (as perhaps they do) by *no viſible Church, none pure and free from corruptions,* which in your judgment is all one with no Church. But the truth is the *corruption* of the Church, and the *deſtruction* of it, is not all one. For if a particular man or Church may (as you confeſs they may) hold ſome particular Errors, and yet be a member of the Church Univerſal: why may not the Church hold ſome Univerſal Error, and yet be ſtill the Church? eſpecially, ſeeing you ſay, it is nothing but *oppoſing the Doctrine of the Church, that makes an Error damnable,* and it is impoſſible that the Church ſhould oppoſe the Church, I mean that the preſent Church ſhould oppoſe it ſelf. And then for the *Engliſh Proteſtants,* though they cenſure your Errors deeply, yet, by your favour, with their deepeſt cenſures it may well conſiſt that *invincible ignorance* may excuſe you from damnation for them. For you your ſelf confeſs *that ignorance may excuſe Errors, even in Fundamental Articles of Faith: ſo that a man ſo erring ſhall not offend at all in ſuch his ignorance or Error*; they are your own words. p. 19. And again with their heavieſt cenſures it may well conſiſt, that your Errors though in themſelves damanble, yet may prove *not damning* to you, if you Die with true repentance, for all your ſins known and unknown.

5. Thus

5. Thus much Charity therefore, if you ſtand to what you have ſaid, is interchangeably granted by each Side to the other, that Neither Religion is ſo fatally *deſtructive, but that by ignorance or repentance Salvation may be had on both Sides:* though with a difference that keeps *Papiſts* ſtill on the more uncharitable Side. For whereas we conceive a lower degree of repentance (that which they call *Attrition*) if it be true, and effectual, and convert the Heart of the Penitent, will ſerve in them: They pretend (even this *Author* which is moſt charitable towards us,) that *without Contrition* there is no hope for us: But though *Proteſtants* may not obtain this purchaſe at ſo eaſie a rate as *Papiſts*, yet (even *Papiſts* being Judges) they may obtain it; and though there is no entrance for them but at the only door of *Contrition*, yet they may enter, Heaven is not inacceſſible to them. Their Errors are no ſuch impenetrable Iſtmus's between them and Salvation, but that *Contrition* may make a way through them. All their Schiſm and Hereſie is no ſuch fatal Poyſon, but that if a man joyn with it the Antidote of a general repentance, he may Die in it, and live for ever. Thus much then being acknowledged, I appeal to any indifferent reader, whether *C. M.* be not by his *Hyperaſpiſt* forſaken in the plain Field, and the point in queſtion granted to D. *Potter*, viz. *That Proteſtancy even without a particular repentance, is not deſtructive of Salvation*; ſo that all the Controverſie remaining now, is, not ſimply whether *Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroys Salvation?* as it was at firſt propoſed, but *Whether Proteſtancy in it ſelf* (that is *abſtracting from ignorance and contrition*) *deſtroys Salvation?* So that as a fooliſh Fellow who gave a Knight the Lie, deſiring withal leave of him to ſet his Knighthood aſide, was anſwered by him, that he would not ſuffer any thing to be ſet aſide that belonged unto him: So might we juſtly take it amiſs, that conceiving as you do Ignorance and Repentance ſuch neceſſary things for us, you are not more willing to conſider us with them, than without them. For my part ſuch is my Charity to you, that conſidering what great neceſſity *You* have, as much as any

Chriſtian

Chriſtian Society in the World, that theſe Sanctuaries of *Ignorance* and *Repentance* ſhould always ſtand open, I can very hardly perſuade my ſelf ſo much as in my moſt ſecret conſideration to deveſt you of theſe ſo needful qualifications: But whenſoever your Errors, ſuperſtitions and impieties come into my mind, (and beſides the general bonds of humanity and Chriſtianity, my own particular Obligations to many of you, ſuch and ſo great, that you cannot periſh without a part of my ſelf,) my only comfort is amidſt theſe Agonies, that the Doctrine and Practice too of Repentance, is yet remaining in your Church: And that though you put on a Face of confidence of your Innocence in point of Doctrine, yet you will be glad to ſtand in the Eye of Mercy as well as your fellows, and not be ſo ſtout, as to refuſe either Gods pardon or the Kings.

6. But for the preſent, Proteſtancy is called to the Barr, and though not ſentenced by you to Death without Mercy, yet arraigned of ſo much natural malignity (if not corrected by *Ignorance* or *Contrition*) as to be *in it ſelf deſtructive of Salvation*. Which controverſie I am content to diſpute with you; only remembring you, that the adding of this limitation [*in it ſelf*] hath made this a new Queſtion, and that this is not the concluſion for which you were charged with *want of Charity*.

7. Ad 7. and 8. §.] C. M. *Now this is our gradation of reaſons. Almighty God having ordained mankind to a ſupernatural end of Eternal Felicity, hath in his providence ſetled competent Means*, &c.

CHIL. In your gradation I ſhall riſe ſo far with you as to grant, *that Chriſt founded a viſible Church, ſtored with all helps neceſſary to Salvation, particularly with ſufficient means to beget and conſerve Faith, to maintain Unity, and compoſe Schiſms, to diſcover and condemn Hereſies, and to determine all controverſies in Religion*, which were neceſſary to be determined. For all theſe purpoſes, he gave at the beginning (as we may ſee in the Ep. to the *Epheſians*) *Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors, and Doctors*: who by word of mouth taught their contemporaries, and by writings

tings (wrote indeed by ſome, but approved by all of them) taught their Chriſtian poſterity to the Worlds End, how all theſe ends, and that which is the End of all theſe ends, Salvation, is to be atchieved. And theſe means the Providence of God hath ſtill preſerved, and ſo preſerved, that they are ſufficient for all theſe intents. I ſay *ſufficient*, though, through the Malice of Men, not always *effectual*, for that the ſame means may be ſufficient for the compaſſing an end, and not effectual, you muſt not deny, who hold that *God gives all men ſufficient means of Salvation, and yet that all are not ſaved.* I ſaid alſo, ſufficient to determine all controverſies, which *were neceſſary to be determined.* For if ſome controverſies may for many Ages be undetermined, and yet in the mean while men be ſaved; why ſhould, or how can the Churches being furniſhed with effectual means to determine *all* Controverſies in Religion be neceſſary to Salvation, the end it ſelf, to which theſe means are ordained being as experience ſhews not neceſſary? Plain ſenſe will teach every man, that the neceſſity of the means muſt always be meaſured by, and can never exceed the neceſſity of the end. As if eating be neceſſary, only that I may live, then certainly if I have no neceſſity to live, I have no neceſſity to eat. If I have no need to be at *London*, I have no need of a Horſe to carry me thither. If I have no need to Fly, I have no need of Wings. Anſwer me then I pray directly, and Categorically, Is it neceſſary that all Controverſies in Religion ſhould be determined, or is it not? If it be, why is the queſtion of *Predetermination*, of the *immaculate conception*, of the *Popes indirect power in temporalties*, ſo long undetermined? if not, what is it but Hypocriſie to pretend ſuch great neceſſity of ſuch effectual means, for the atchieving that end, which is it ſelf not neceſſary. Chriſtians therefore have and ſhall have *means ſufficient* (though not always effectual) *to determine* not all *controverſies* but *all neceſſary to be determined.* I proceed on farther with you, and grant that this means to decide controverſies in Faith and Religion, muſt be indued with an Univerſal Infallibility in whatſoever it pro-

poundeth for a Divine truth. For if it may be falſe in any one thing of this nature, in any thing which God requires men to believe, we can yield unto it but a wavering and fearful aſſent in any thing. Theſe grounds therefore I grant very readily, and give you free leave to make your beſt advantage of them. And yet, to deal truly, I do not perceive how from the denial of any of them it would follow that Faith is Opinion: or from the granting them, that it is not ſo. But for my part, whatſoever clamour you have raiſed againſt me, I think no otherwiſe of the Nature of Faith, I mean *Hiſtorical Faith*, than generally both *Proteſtants* and *Papiſts* do; for I conceive it *an aſſent to Divine Revelations upon the Authority of the revealer*. Which though in many things it differ from Opinion, (as commonly the Word *Opinion* is underſtood) yet in ſome things, I doubt not but you will confeſs, that it agrees with it. As firſt, that as Opinion is an Aſſent, ſo is Faith alſo. Secondly, that as Opinion, ſo Faith is always built upon leſs evidence than that of Sence or Science. Which aſſertion you not only grant but mainly contend for in your *ſixth Ch.* Thirdly and laſtly, that as Opinion, ſo Faith admits degrees; and that as there may be a ſtrong and weak Opinion, ſo there may be a ſtrong and weak Faith. Theſe things if you will grant (as ſure if you be in your right mind you will not deny any of them) I am well contented that this ill-ſounding Word, *Opinion*, ſhould be diſcarded, and that among the Intellectual habits you ſhould ſeek out ſome other *Genus* for *Faith*. For I will never contend with any man about Words, who grants my meaning.

8. *But though the Eſſence of Faith exclude not all weakneſs and imperfection, yet may it be enquired, whether any certainty of Faith, under the higheſt degree may be ſufficient to pleaſe God and attain Salvation.* Whereunto I anſwer, that though men are unreaſonable, God requires not any thing but Reaſon. They will not be pleaſed without a down weight, but God is contented if the Scale be turned. They pretend, that Heavenly things cannot be ſeen to any purpoſe, but by the mid-day-light: But God will be ſatisfied,

ed, if we receive any degree of light which makes us leave the *Works of Darkneſs and walk as Children of the Light.* They exact a certainty of Faith above that of Sence or Science, God deſires only that we believe the concluſion, as much as the premiſes deſerve, that the ſtrength of our Faith be equal or proportionable to the credibility of the Motives to it. Now though I have and ought to have an abſolute certainty of this Theſis, *All which God reveals for truth is true,* being a propoſition that may be demonſtrated, or rather ſo evident to any one that underſtands it, that it needs it not; Yet of this Hypotheſis, *That all the Articles of our Faith were revealed by God,* we cannot ordinarily have any rational and acquired certainty, more than moral, founded upon theſe conſiderations: Firſt that the goodneſs of the precepts of Chriſtianity, and the greatneſs of the promiſes of it, ſhews it, of all other Religions, moſt likely to come from the Fountain of goodneſs. And then that a conſtant, famous and very general Tradition, ſo credible, that no Wiſe Man doubts of any other, which hath but the Fortieth part of the credibility of this, ſuch and ſo credible a Tradition, tells us, that God himſelf hath ſet his Hand and Seal to the Truth of this Doctrine, by doing great, and glorious, and frequent miracles in confirmation of it. Now our Faith is an aſſent to this concluſion, that *the Doctrine of Chriſtianity is true,* which being deduced from the former *Theſis,* which is Metapyhſically certain, and from the former *Hypotheſis,* whereof we can have but a Moral certainty, we cannot poſſibly by natural means be more certain of it than of the weaker of the premiſes; as a River will not riſe higher than the Fountain from which it flows. For the concluſion always follows the worſer part, if there be any worſe: and muſt be Negative, Particular, Contingent, or but Morally certain, if any of the Propoſitions, from whence it is derived be ſo: Neither can we be certain of it in the higheſt degree, unleſs we be thus certain of all the principles whereon it is grounded. As a man cannot go or ſtand ſtrongly, if either of his Legs be weak. Or as a building cannot be ſtable, if any one

of the neceſſary Pillars thereof be infirm and inſtable. Or as, If a meſſage be brought me, from a man of abſolute credit with me, but by a meſſenger that is not ſo, my confidence of the Truth of the Relation, cannot but be rebated and leſſened, by my diffidence in the Relator.

9. Yet all this I ſay not as if I doubted, that the Spirit of God, being implored by devout and humble Prayer and ſincere obedience, may, and will by degrees, advance his ſervants higher, and give them a certainty of adherence, beyond their certainty of evidence. But what God gives as a reward to believers, is one thing: and what he requires of all men, as their duty, is another: and what he will accept of out of grace and favour, is yet another. To thoſe that believe and live according to their Faith, he gives by degrees the *ſpirit of obſignation and confirmation*, which makes them know (though how they know not) what they did but believe: And to be as fully and reſolutely aſſured of the Goſpel of Chriſt, as thoſe which heard it from Chriſt himſelf with their Ears, which ſaw it with their Eyes, which looked upon it, and whoſe hands handled the Word of Life. He requires of all, that their Faith ſhould be (as I have ſaid) proportionable to the motives and Reaſons enforcing to it; he will accept of the weakeſt and loweſt degree of Faith, if it be living and effectual unto true obedience. For he it is that *will not quench the ſmoaking Flax, nor break the bruiſed Reed.* He did not reject the Prayer of that diſtreſſed man that cried unto him, *Lord I believe, Lord help my unbelief.* He commands us to *receive them that are weak in Faith*, and thereby declares that he receives them. And as nothing avails with him, but Faith *wich worketh by love:* So any Faith, if it be but as a *grain of Muſtard ſeed*, if it *work by love*, ſhall certainly avail with him and be accepted of him. Some experience makes me fear, that the Faith of conſidering and diſcourſing men, is like to be crackt with too much ſtraining: And that being poſſeſſed with this *falſe* Principle, that it is in vain to believe the Goſpel of Chriſt, with ſuch a kind or degree of aſſent, as they yield to other matters of Tradition: And finding that their Faith of it,

is

is to them undiſcernable, from the belief they give to the truth of other Stories; are in danger either not to believe at all, thinking not at all as good as to no purpoſe, or elſe, though indeed they do believe it, yet to think they do not, and to caſt themſelves into wretched agonies and perplexities, as fearing they have not that, without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God and obtain Eternal happineſs. Conſideration of this advantage, which the Devil probably may make of this Phanſie, made me willing to inſiſt ſomewhat largely upon the Refutation of it.

10. I return now thither from whence I have digreſſed, and aſſure you, concerning the grounds afore-laid, which were, that there is a *Rule of Faith, whereby controverſies may be decided, which are neceſſary to be decided*, and that *this rule is Univerſally infallible*, That notwithſtanding any Opinion I hold, touching Faith, or any thing elſe, I may, and do believe them, as firmly as you pretend to do. And therefore you may build on, in Gods name, for by Gods help, I ſhall always embrace, whatſoever ſtructure is naturally and rationally laid upon them, whatſoever concluſion may, to my underſtanding, be evidently deduced from them. You ſay, out of them it undeniably follows, *That of two diſagreeing in matter of Faith, the one cannot be ſaved, but by Repentance or Ignorance.* I anſwer by diſtinction of thoſe terms, *two diſſenting in a matter of Faith.* For it may be either in a thing which is indeed a *matter of Faith*, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, that is, ſomething, the Belief whereof God requires under pain of damnation: And ſo the concluſion is true, though the Conſequence of it from your former premiſſes either is none at all, or ſo obſcure, that I can hardly diſcern it. Or it may be as it oftens falls out concerning a thing which being indeed *no matter of Faith, is yet overvalued* by the Parties at variance, and eſteemed to be ſo. And in this ſenſe it is neither conſequent nor true. The untruth of it I have already declared in my examination of your Preface. The inconſequence of it is of it ſelf evident; for who ever heard of a wilder Collection than this ——

God

God hath provided means ſufficient to decide all Controverſies in Religion, neceſſary to be decided;
This means is Univerſally infallible,
Therefore of two, that differ in any thing which they eſteem a matter of Faith, one cannot be ſaved.

He that can find any connection between theſe Propoſitions, I believe will be able to find good coherence between the Deaf Plantiff's Accuſation, in the *Greek* Epigram, and the Deaf Defendants Anſwer, and the Deaf Judges Sentence: And to contrive them all into a formal Categorical Syllogiſm.

11. Indeed if the matter in agitation were plainly decided, by this infallible means of deciding Controverſies, and the Parties in variance knew it to be ſo, and yet would ſtand out in their diſſention; this were in one of them, direct oppoſition to the Teſtimony of God, and undoubtedly a damnable ſin. But if you take the liberty to ſuppoſe what you pleaſe, you may very eaſily conclude what you liſt. For who is ſo fooliſh as to grant you theſe unreaſonable Poſtulates, that every emergent Controverſie of Faith, is plainly decided by the means of diciſion which God hath appointed, and that of the Parties litigant, one is always ſuch a convicted Recuſant as you pretend! Certainly, if you ſay ſo, having no better warrant than you have, or can have for it, this is more proper and formal uncharitableneſs, than ever was charged upon you. Methinks, with much more Reaſon, and much more Charity, you might ſuppoſe, that many of theſe Controverſies which are now diſputed among Chriſtians (all which profeſs themſelves lovers of Chriſt, and truly deſirous to know his Will and do it) are either *not decidable* by that means which God hath provided, and ſo not neceſſary to be decided: Or if they be, yet *not ſo plainly and evidently*, as to oblige all men to hold one way: or Laſtly, if decidable, and evidently decided, yet you may hope that the erring part, by reaſon of ſome Vail before his Eyes, *ſome excuſable ignorance or unavoidable prejudice*, does not ſee the Queſtion to be decided againſt him, and ſo oppoſes not that which He doth

doth know to be the word of God, but only that which You know to be ſo, and which he might know, were he void of prejudice. Which is a fault I confeſs, but a fault which is incident even to good and honeſt men very often: and not of ſuch a gigantick diſpoſition as you make it, to fly directly upon God Almighty, and to give him the Lie to his Face.

12. Ad 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. §.] In all this long diſcourſe you only tell us what you will do, but do nothing, but reſerve them to the Chapters following, and there they ſhall be examined. The Sum of all collected by your ſelf, §. 16. is this.

That *the Infallible means of determining Controverſies, is the Viſible Church.*

That *the diſtinction of points Fundamental, and not Fundamental, maketh nothing to the preſent Queſtion.*

That *to ſay the Creed containeth all Fundamentals, is neither pertinent nor true.*

That *whoſoever perſiſt in Diviſion from the Communion and Faith of the* Roman *Church are guilty of Schiſm and Hereſie.*

That *in regard of the Precept of Charity towards one ſelf,* Proteſtants *are in ſtate of Sin, while they remain divided from the* Roman *Church.*

To all theſe Aſſertions I will content my ſelf for the preſent to oppoſe this one, That *not one of them all is true.* Only I may not omit to tell you, that if the firſt of them were as true as the *Pope* himſelf deſires it ſhould be, yet the Corollary which you deduce from it, would be utterly inconſequent, That *whoſoever denys any point propoſed by the Church, is injurious to Gods Divine Majeſty, as if he could deceive, or be deceived.* For though your Church were indeed as *Infallible a Propounder of Divine Truths* as it pretends to be, yet if it appeared not to me to be ſo, I might very well believe God moſt true, and your Church moſt falſe. As though the Goſpel of S. *Matthew* be the Word of God, yet if I neither knew it to be ſo, nor believed it, I might believe in God, and yet think that Goſpel a Fable. Hereafter therefore I muſt entreat you to remember,

remember, that our being guilty of this impiety, depends not only upon your being, but upon our knowing that you are ſo. Neither muſt you argue thus, *The Church of* Rome *is the Infallible Propounder of Divine Verities, therefore he that oppoſes Her calls Gods Truth in Queſtion:* But thus rather; The *Church of* Rome *is ſo, and* Proteſtants *know it to be ſo, therefore in oppoſing Her, they impute to God, that either he deceives them, or is deceived himſelf.* For as I may deny ſomething which you upon your knowledg have affirmed, and yet never diſparage your honeſty, if I never knew that you affirmed it: So I may be undoubtedly certain of Gods Omniſcience, and Veracity, and yet doubt of ſomething which he hath revealed, provided I do not know, nor believe that he hath revealed it. So, that though your Church be the appointed witneſs of Gods Revelations; yet until you know, that we know ſhe is ſo, you cannot without foul Calumny impute to us, That *we charge God blaſphemouſly with deceiving, or being deceived.* You will ſay perhaps, That this is directly conſequent from our Doctrine, That the *Church may Err*, which is directed by God in all Her propoſals. True, if we knew it to be directed by him, otherwiſe not; much leſs if we believe, and know the contrary. But then if it were conſequent from our Opinion, have you ſo little Charity as to ſay, that men are *juſtly chargeable with all the conſequences of their Opinions.*; Such conſequences, I mean, as they do not own but diſclaim, and if there were a neceſſity of doing either, would much rather forſake their Opinion than embrace theſe Conſequences? What Opinion is there that draws after it ſuch a Train of *portentous Blaſphemies*, as that of the *Dominicans*, by the judgment of the beſt Writers of your own *Order?* And will you ſay now that the *Dominicans* are juſtly chargeable with all theſe Blaſphemies? If not, ſeeing our caſe (take it at the worſt) is but the ſame, why ſhould not your judgment of us be the ſame? I appeal to all thoſe *Proteſtants* that have gone over to your Side; whether when they were moſt averſe from it, they did ever deny or doubt of *Gods omniſcience or veracity*;

whe-

whether they did ever believe, or were taught, that *God did deceive them, or was deceived himſelf.* Nay, I provoke to you your ſelf, and deſire you to deal truly, and to tell Us whether you do in your Heart believe, that we do indeed not believe the Eternal Veracity of the Eternal Verity? And if you judge ſo ſtrangely of us, having no better ground for it, than you have or can have, we ſhall not need any farther proof of your uncharitableneſs towards us, this being the extremity of true uncharitableneſs. If not, then I hope having no other ground but this (which ſure is none at all) to pronounce us *damnable Hereticks*, you will ceaſe to do ſo; and hereafter (as, if your ground be true, you may do with more truth and Charity) Collect thus, *They only Err damnably, who oppoſe what they know God hath teſtified,* But Proteſtants *ſure do not oppoſe what they know God hath teſtified, at leaſt we cannot with Charity ſay they do, Therefore they either do not Err damnably, or with Charity we cannot ſay they do ſo.*

13. Ad 17. §.] *Proteſtants* (you ſay) *according to their own grounds muſt hold that of Perſons contrary in whatſoever point of belief one part only can be ſaved, therefore it is ſtrangely done of them to charge* Papiſts *with want of Charity for holding the ſame.* The conſequence I acknowledg, but wonder much what it ſhould be that lays upon *Proteſtants* any neceſſity to do ſo! You tell us it is their holding *Scripture the ſole Rule of Faith*: for this, you ſay, obligeth them to pronounce them damned, that oppoſe any leaſt point *delivered in Scripture.* This I grant, If they oppoſe it after ſufficient declaration, ſo that either they *know it to be contained in Scripture,* or have no juſt probable Reaſon, and which may move an honeſt man to doubt whether or no it be there contained. For to oppoſe in the firſt Caſe in a man that believes the Scripture to be the Word of God, is to give God the Lie. To oppoſe in the ſecond, is to be obſtinate againſt Reaſon, and therefore a ſin though not ſo great as the former. But then this is nothing to the purpoſe of the neceſſity of damning all thoſe that are of contrary belief; and that for theſe Reaſons. Firſt, becauſe the contrary belief may be touch-

ing a point not at all mentioned in Scripture; and ſuch points, though indeed they be not *matters of Faith*, yet by men in variance are often over-valued and eſteemed to be ſo. So that, though it were damnable to oppoſe any point contained in Scripture; yet Perſons of a contrary belief (as *Victor* and *Polycrates*, S. *Cyprian*, and *Stephen*) might both be ſaved, becauſe their contrary belief was not touching any point contained in Scripture. Secondly, becauſe the contrary belief may be about the ſenſe of ſome place of Scripture which is ambiguous, and with probability capable of diverſe Senſes; and in ſuch Caſes it is no marvel, and ſure no Sin, if ſeveral men go ſeveral ways. Thirdly, becauſe the contrary belief may be concerning points wherein Scripture may with ſo great probability be alledged on both ſides, (which is a ſure note of a point *not neceſſary*) that men of honeſt and upright Hearts, true lovers of God and of truth, ſuch as deſire, above all things, to know Gods Will and to do it, may, without any fault at all, ſome go one way, and ſome another, and ſome (and thoſe as good men as either of the former) ſuſpend their judgments, and expect ſome *Elias to ſolve doubts*, and reconcile repugnances. Now in all ſuch Queſtions one ſide or other (which ſoever it is) holds that which indeed is oppoſite to the ſenſe of the Scripture, which God intended; for it is impoſſible that God ſhould intend Contradictions. But then this intended Senſe is not ſo fully declared, but that they which oppoſe it may verily believe that they indeed maintain it, and have great ſhew of reaſon to induce them to believe ſo; and therefore are not to be damned, as men oppoſing that which they either know to be a truth delivered in Scripture, or have no probable Reaſon to believe the contrary; but rather in Charity to be acquitted and abſolved, as men who endeavour to find the Truth, but fail of it through humane frailty.

This ground being laid, the Anſwer to your enſuing Interrogatories, which you conceive impoſſible, is very obvious and eaſie.

14. *To*

14. *To the firſt, Whether it be not in any man a grievous ſin to deny any any one Truth contained in holy Writ?* I anſwer, Yes, if he knew it to be ſo, or have no probable Reaſon to doubt of it: otherwiſe not.

15. *To the ſecond, Whether there be in ſuch denial any diſtinction between Fundamental and not Fundamental ſufficient to excuſe from Hereſie?* I anſwer, Yes, There is ſuch a diſtinction. But the Reaſon is, becauſe theſe points, either in themſelves, or by accident, are *Fundamental*, which are *evidently contained in Scripture, to him that knows them to be ſo:* Thoſe not Fundamental which are there-hence deducible but probably only, not evidently.

16. *To the third, Whether it be not impertinent to alledge the Creed as containing all Fundamental points of Faith, as if believing it alone we were at Liberty to deny all other Points of Scripture?* I anſwer, It was never alledged to any ſuch purpoſe; but only as a ſufficient, or rather more than a ſufficient Summary of thoſe points of Faith, which were of neceſſity to be believed actually and explicitely; and that only of ſuch which were meerly and purely *Credenda*, and not *Agenda*.

17. *To the fourth*, drawn as a Corollary from the former, *Whether this be not to ſay, that of Perſons contrary in belief, one part only can be ſaved?* I anſwer, By no means. For they may differ about points *not contained in Scripture*: They may differ about the *ſenſe of ſome ambiguous Texts* of Scripture: They may differ about ſome Doctrines, for and againſt which Scriptures may be alledged with *ſo great probability*, as may juſtly excuſe either Part from Hereſie, and a ſelf-condemning obſtinacy. And therefore, though *D. Potter* do not take it ill, that you believe your ſelves may be ſaved in your Religion; yet notwithſtanding all that hath yet been pretended to the contrary, he may juſtly condemn you, and that out of your own principles, of *uncharitable preſumption*, for affirming as you do, that *no man can be ſaved out of it.*

CHAP. II.

The ANSWER to the Second CHAPTER.

Concerning the means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our underſtanding; and which muſt determine Controverſies in Faith and Religion.

C. M. *Of our eſtimation, reſpect and reverence to holy Scripture, even* Proteſtants *themſelves give Teſtimony, while they poſſeſs it from us, and take it upon the integrity of our cuſtody,* &c.

CHIL. Ad §. 1.] He that would Uſurp an abſolute Lordſhip and Tyranny over any People, need not put himſelf to the trouble and difficulty of abrogating and diſanulling the Laws, made to maintain the Common Liberty; for he may fruſtrate their intent, and compaſs his own deſign as well, if he can get the Power and Authority to interpret them as he pleaſes, and add to them what he pleaſes, and to have his interpretations and additions ſtand for Laws; if he can rule his People by his Laws, and his Laws by his Lawyers. So the *Church of* Rome, to eſtabliſh Her Tyranny over mens Conſciences, needed not either to aboliſh or corrupt the Holy Scriptures, the Pillars and Supporters of Chriſtian Liberty (which in regard of the numerous multitude of Copies diſperſed through all places, Tranſlated into almoſt all Languages, guarded with all ſollicitous care and induſtry, had been an impoſſible attempt;) But the more expedite way, and therefore more likely to be ſucceſsful, was to gain the opinion and eſteem of the *publick and authorized interpreter* of them, and the Authority of adding to them what Doctrine ſhe pleaſed under the Title of *Traditions* or *Definitions*. For by this means, ſhe might both ſerve her ſelf of all thoſe cauſes of Scripture, which might be drawn to caſt a favourable countenance upon Her ambitious pretences, which in caſe the Scripture had been aboliſhed, ſhe could not have done; and yet be ſecure enough of having

having either her Power limitted, or her corruptions and abuſes reformed by them; this being once ſetled in the minds of men, that *unwritten Doctrines, if propoſed by her, were to be received with equal reverence to thoſe that were written:* and that *the ſenſe of Scripture was not that which ſeemed to mens reaſon and underſtanding to be ſo, but that which the Church of* Rome *ſhould declare to be ſo, ſeemed it never ſo unreaſonable, and incongruous.* The matter being once thus ordered, and the holy Scriptures being made in effect not your Directors and Judges (no farther than you pleaſe) but your *Servants and Inſtruments,* always preſt and in readineſs to advance your deſigns, and diſabled wholly with minds ſo qualified to prejudice or impeach them; it is ſafe for you to put a Crown on their head, and a Reed in their Hands, and to bow before them, and cry, *Hail King of the* Jews! to pretend a great deal of *eſteem, and reſpect, and reverence* to them, as here you do. But to little purpoſe is verbal reverence without entire ſubmiſſion and ſincere obedience; and, as our Saviour ſaid of ſome, ſo the Scripture, could it ſpeak, I believe would ſay to you, Why *call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not that which I command you?* Caſt away the vain and arrogant pretence of *Infallibility,* which makes your Errors incurable. Leave Picturing God, and Worſhiping him by Pictures. *Teach not for Doctrine the Commandments of men.* Debar not the Laity of the Teſtament of Chriſt's Blood. Let your publick *Prayers,* and *Pſalms* and *Hymes* be in ſuch Language as is for the Edification of the Aſſiſtants. Take not from the Clergy that Liberty of Marriage which Chriſt hath left them. Do not impoſe upon men that *Humility of Worſhiping Angels* which S. *Paul* condemns. Teach no more proper Sacrifices of Chriſt but one. Acknowledge them *that Die in Chriſt to be bleſſed, and to reſt from their Labours.* Acknowledge the Sacrament after Conſecration, to be Bread and Wine, as well as Chriſts Body and Blood. Acknowledge the gift of continency without Marriage not to be given to all. Let not the Weapons of your Warfare be Carnal; ſuch as are Maſſacres, Treaſons, Perſecutions, and in a word all means

either

either violent or fraudulent: Theſe and other things, which the Scripture commands you, do, and then we ſhall willingly give you ſuch Teſtimony as you deſerve; but till you do ſo, to talk of eſtimation, reſpect, and reverence to the Scripture, is nothing elſe but talk.

2. For neither is that true which you pretend, *That we poſſeſs the Scripture from you, or take it upon the integrity of your Cuſtody*, but upon *Univerſal Tradition*, of which you are but a little part. Neither, If it were true that *Proteſtants* acknowledged, *The integrity of it to have been guarded by your alone Cuſtody*, were this any argument of your reverence towards them. For firſt, you might preſerve them entire, not for want of Will, but of Power to corrupt them, *as it is a hard thing to Poyſon the Sea.* And then having prevailed ſo far with men, as either not to look at all into them, or but only through ſuch ſpectacles as you ſhould pleaſe to make for them, and to ſee nothing in them, though as clear as the Sun, if it any way made againſt you, you might keep them entire, without any thought or care to conform your Doctrine to them, or reform it by them (which were indeed to reverence the Scriptures) but out of a perſuaſion, that you could qualifie them well enough with your gloſſes and interpretations, and make them ſufficiently conformable to your preſent Doctrine, at leaſt, in their judgment, who were prepoſſeſſed with this perſuaſion, that *your Church was to judge of the ſenſe of Scripture, not to be judged by it.*

3. Whereas you ſay, *No cauſe imaginable could avert your will from giving the function of Supream and ſole judge to holy Writ, but that the thing is impoſſible, and that by this means controverſies are encreaſed and not ended.* What indifferent and unprejudiced man may not eaſily conceive another cauſe which (I do not ſay does, but certainly) may prevert your Wills, and avert your underſtandings from ſubmitting your Religion and Church to a *Tryal by Scripture.* I mean the great and apparent and unavoidable danger which by this means you would fall into, of loſing the Opinion which men have of your Infallibility, and conſequently your Power and Authority over mens Conſciences,

ſciences, and all that depends upon it; ſo that though *Diana of the Epheſians* be cryed up, yet it may be feared that with a great many among you (though I cenſure or judge no man) the other cauſe which wrought upon *Demetrius* and the *Craftsmen*, may have with you alſo the more effectual, though more ſecret influence: and that is, that *by this craft we have our living*; by this craft, I mean of keeping your Proſelytes from an indifferent Tryal of your Religion by Scripture, and making them yield up and captivate their judgment unto yours.

As for the impoſſibility of Scriptures being the ſole Judge of Controverſies, that is, *the ſole rule for man to judge them by* (for we mean nothing elſe) you only affirm it without proof, as if the thing were evident of it ſelf. And therefore I, conceiving the contrary to be more evident, might well content my ſelf to deny it without refutation. Yet I cannot but deſire you to tell me, If Scripture cannot be the Judge of any Controverſie, how ſhall that touching the *Church and the Notes of it* be determined? And if it be the ſole Judge of this one, why may it not of others? Why not of All? Thoſe only excepted wherein the Scripture it ſelf is the ſubject of the Queſtion, which cannot be determined but by natural reaſon, the only Principle, beſide Scripture, which is common to Chriſtians.

4. Then for the Imputation of *increaſing contentions and not ending them*, Scripture is innocent of it; as alſo this Opinion; *That Controverſies are to be decided by Scripture.* For if men did really and ſincerely ſubmit their judgments to Scripture, and that only, and would require no more of any man but to do ſo, it were impoſſible but that all Controverſies, touching things neceſſary and very profitable ſhould be ended: and if others were continued or increaſed, it were no matter.

5. In the next Words we have direct *Boyes-play*; a thing given with one hand and taken away with the other; an acknowledgment made in one line, and retracted in the next. *We acknowledge* (ſay you) *Scripture to be a perfect rule, for as much as a writing can be a Rule, only*

only we deny that it excludes unwritten Tradition. As if you ſhould have ſaid, we acknowledge it to be as perfect a Rule as a writing can be; only we deny it to be as perfect a Rule as a writing may be. Either therefore you muſt revoke your acknowledgment, or retract your retractation of it; for both cannot poſſibly ſtand together. For if you will ſtand to what you have granted, That *Scripture is as perfect a Rule of Faith as a Writing can be:* you muſt then grant it both ſo *Compleat*, that it needs no addition, and ſo *evident*, that it needs no interpretation: For both theſe properties are requiſite to a *perfect rule*; and a Writing is capable of both theſe properties.

6. That both theſe Properties are requiſite to a *perfect rule*, it is apparent: Becauſe that is not perfect in any kind which wants ſome parts belonging to its integrity: As he is not a perfect man that wants any part appertaining to the Integrity of a Man; and therefore that which wants any acceſſion to make it a perfect rule, of its ſelf is not a perfect Rule. And then, the end of a *rule* is to regulate and direct. Now every inſtrument is more or leſs perfect in its kind, as it is more or leſs fit to attain the end for which it is ordained: But nothing obſcure or unevident while it is ſo, is fit to regulate and direct them to whom it is ſo: Therefore it is requiſite alſo to a *rule* (ſo far as it is a Rule) to be evident; otherwiſe indeed it is no *rule*, becauſe it cannot ſerve for direction. I conclude therefore, that both theſe properties are required to a perfect Rule: both to be ſo compleat as to need no Addition; and to be ſo evident as to need no Interpretation.

7. Now that a Writing is capable of both theſe perfections, it is ſo plain, that I am even aſhamed to prove it. For he that denies it muſt ſay, That *ſomething may be ſpoken which cannot be written.* For if ſuch a compleat and evident rule of Faith may be delivered by word of mouth, as you pretend it may, and is; and whatſoever is delivered by word of mouth may alſo be written; then ſuch a compleat and evident rule of Faith may alſo be written. If you will have more light added to the Sun, anſwer me then to theſe Queſtions. Whether your Church can ſet down in writing

ting all theſe, which ſhe pretends to be Divine unwritten Traditions, and add them to the verities already written? And whether ſhe can ſet us down ſuch interpretations of all obſcurities in the Faith as ſhall need no farther interpretations? If ſhe cannot, then ſhe hath not that power which you pretend ſhe hath, of being an *Infallible Teacher of all Divine verities*, and an infallible interpreter of obſcurities in the Faith: for ſhe cannot teach us all Divine verities, if ſhe cannot write them down; neither is that an interpretation which needs again to be interpreted: If ſhe can; Let her do it, and then we ſhall have a writing, not only capable of, but, actually endowed with both theſe perfections, of being both ſo compleat as to need no Addition, and ſo evident as to need no Interpretation. Laſtly, whatſoever your Church can do or not do, no man can without Blaſphemy deny, that *Chriſt Jeſus*, if he had pleaſed, could have writ us a rule of Faith ſo plain and perfect, as that it ſhould have wanted neither any part to make up its integrity, nor any clearneſs to make it ſufficiently intelligible: And if Chriſt could have done this, then the thing might have been done; a writing there might have been indowed with both theſe properties. Thus therefore I conclude, a writing may be ſo perfect a Rule, as to need neither Addition nor Interpretation; But the *Scripture you acknowledge a perfect Rule for as much as a writing can be a Rule*, therefore it needs neither Addition nor Interpretation.

8. You will ſay, *that though a writing be never ſo perfect a Rule of Faith, yet it muſt be beholden to Tradition to give it this Teſtimony, that it is a Rule of Faith, and the Word of God.* I anſwer: Firſt, there is no abſolute neceſſity of this. For God might, if he thought good, give it the atteſtation of perpetual Miracles. Secondly, that it is one thing to be a perfect Rule of Faith, another to be proved ſo unto us. And thus though a writing could not be proved to us to be a perfect rule of Faith, by its own ſaying ſo, for nothing is proved true by being ſaid or written in a Book, but only by Tradition which is a thing credible of it ſelf; yet it may be ſo in it ſelf, and contain

all the material Objects, all the particular Articles of our Faith, without any dependance upon Tradition; even this alſo not excepted, that *this Writing doth contain the rule of Faith.* Now when *Proteſtants* affirm againſt *Papiſts*, that *Scripture is a perfect rule of Faith*, their meaning is not, that by Scripture all things abſolutely may be proved, which are to be believed: For it can never be proved by Scripture to a gainſayer, that there is a God, or that the Book called Scripture is the Word of God; For he that will deny theſe Aſſertions when they are ſpoken, will believe them never a whit the more becauſe you can ſhew them written: But their meaning is, that the Scripture, to them which preſuppoſe it Divine, and a Rule of Faith, as *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants* do, contains all the material Objects of Faith; is a compleat and Total, and not only an imperfect and a partial Rule.

9. *But every Book and Chapter, and Text of Scripture is Infallible and wants no due perfection, and yet excludes not the Addition of other Book, of Scripture; Therefore the perfection of the whole Scripture excludes not the Addition of unwritten Tradition.* I anſwer; Every Text of Scripture though it have the perfection belonging to a Text of Scripture, yet it hath not the perfection requiſite to a *perfect Rule of Faith*; and that only is the perfection which is the ſubject of our diſcourſe. So that this is to abuſe your Reader with the ambiguity of the word *Perfect.* In effect, as if you ſhould ſay, a Text of Scripture may be a perfect Text, though there be others beſide it; therefore the whole Scripture may be a perfect Rule of Faith, though there be other parts of this Rule, beſides the Scripture, and though the Scripture be but a part of it.

10. The next Argument to the ſame purpoſe is, for Sophiſtry, Coſin German to the former. *When the firſt Books of Scripture were written, they did not exclude unwritter Tradition: Therefore now alſo, that all the Books of Scripture are written, Traditions are not excluded.* The ſenſe of which Argument (if it have any) muſt be this. When only a part of the Scripture was written, then a part of the Divine Doctrine was unwritten; Therefore now when

when all the Scripture is written, yet ſome part of the Divine Doctrine is yet unwritten. If you ſay, your concluſion is not that it is ſo, but without diſparagement to Scripture, may be ſo: without diſparagement to the truth of Scripture, I grant it; but without diſparagement to the Scriptures being a *perfect Rule*, I deny it. And now the Queſtion is not of the Truth, but the perfection of it; which are very different things, though you would fain confound them. For Scripture might very well be all true, though it contain not all neceſſary Divine Truth. But unleſs it do ſo, it cannot be a *perfect Rule of Faith*; for that which wants any thing is not perfect. For I hope you do not imagine, that we conceive any Antipathy between Gods Word Written and unwritten, but that both might very well ſtand together. All that we ſay is this, that we have reaſon to believe that God *de Facto*, hath ordered the matter ſo, that all the Goſpel of Chriſt, the whole Covenant between God and Man, is now Written. Whereas if he had pleaſed, he might ſo have diſpoſed it, that part might have been written, and part unwritten: but then he would have taken order, to whom we ſhould have had recourſe, for that part of it which was not written; which ſeeing he hath not done (as the Progreſs ſhall demonſtrate) it is evident he hath left no part of it unwritten. We know no man therefore that ſays, It were any injury to the written Word to be joyned with the unwritten, if there were any wherewith it might be joyned; but that we deny. The fidelity of a Keeper may very well conſiſt with the Authority of the thing committed to his Cuſtody. But we know no one Society of Chriſtians that is ſuch a faithful Keeper as you pretend. The Scripture it ſelf was not kept ſo faithfully by you, but that you ſuffered infinite variety of Readings to creep into it; all which could not poſſibly be Divine, and yet, in ſeveral parts of your Church, all of them, until the laſt Age, were ſo eſteemed. The interpretations of obſcure places of Scripture, which without Queſtion, the Apoſtles taught the Primitive Chriſtians are wholly loſt; there remains no certain-

ty ſcarce of any one. Thoſe *Worlds of Miracles*, which our Saviour did, which were not written, for want of writing are vaniſhed out of the memory of men. And many profitable things which the Apoſtles taught and writ not, as that which S. *Paul* glances at, in his *ſecond Epiſtle to the* Theſalon. of the *cauſe of the hindrance of the coming of Antichriſt*, are wholly loſt and extinguiſhed. So unfaithful or negligent hath been this keeper of Divine verities; whoſe eyes, like the Keepers of *Iſrael* (you ſay) have *never Slumbred nor Slept*. Laſtly, we deny not but a Judge and a Law might well ſtand together, but we deny that there is any ſuch Judge of Gods appointment. Had he intended any ſuch Judge, he would have named him, leſt otherwiſe (as now it is) our *Judge of Controverſies* ſhould be our greateſt Controverſie.

11. Ad 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. §.] In your ſecond Paragraph, you ſum up thoſe arguments wherewith you intend to prove, that *Scripture alone cannot be Judge in Controverſies*. Wherein I profeſs unto you before hand, that you will fight without an Adverſary. For though *Proteſtants*, being warranted by ſome of the Fathers, have called Scripture the *Judge of Controverſies*; and you in ſaying here, That Scripture *alone* cannot be Judge, imply that it may be called in ſome ſenſe a Judge, though not alone: Yet to ſpeak properly (as men ſhould ſpeak when they write of Controverſies in Religion) the Scripture is not a Judge of Controverſies, but *a Rule only and the only Rule for Chriſtians to judge them by*. Every man is to Judge for himſelf with the *Judgment of Diſcretion*, and to chooſe either his Religion firſt, and then his Church, as we ſay: or as you, his Church firſt, and then his Religion. But by the conſent of both ſides, every man is to judge and chooſe: and the Rule whereby he is to guide his choice, if he be a natural man, is Reaſon, if he be already a Chriſtian, Scripture, which we ſay is the Rule to judge Controverſies by. Yet not all ſimply, but all the Controverſies of Chriſtians, of thoſe, that are already agreed upon This firſt Principle that, *the Scripture is the Word of God*. But that there is any man, or any company of men appointed

ed to be judge for all men, that we deny, and that I believe you will never prove. The very truth is, we ſay no more in this matter, than evidence of Truth hath made you confeſs in plain terms in the beginning of this chap. *viz.* That *Scripture is a perfect Rule of Faith, for as much as a writing can be a Rule.* So that all your reaſons whereby you labour to dethrone the Scripture from this office of *Judging*, we might let paſs as impertinent to the concluſion which we maintain, and you have already granted; yet out of courteſie we will conſider them.

12. Your firſt is this; *a Judge muſt be a perſon fit to end Controverſies, but the Scripture is not a perſon, nor fit to end Controverſies, no more than the Law would be without the Judges, therefore though it may be a Rule it cannot be a Judge.* Which concluſion I have already granted. Only my requeſt is, that you will permit Scripture to have the properties of a Rule, that is, to be fit to direct every one that will make the beſt uſe of it, to that end for which it was ordained. And that is as much as we need deſire. For as if I were to go a Journey and had a guide which could not Err, I needed not to know my way: ſo on the other ſide, if I know my way or have a plain rule to know it by, I ſhall need no guide. Grant therefore Scripture to be ſuch a Rule, and it will quickly take away all neceſſity of having an Infallible guide. But *without a living Judge it will be no fitter* (you ſay) *to end Controverſies, than the Law alone to end Suits.* I anſwer, if the Law were plain and perfect, and men honeſt and deſirous to underſtand aright, and obey it, he that ſays it were not fit to end Controverſies, muſt either want underſtanding himſelf, or think the World wants it. Now the Scripture, we pretend, *in things neceſſary is plain and perfect*, and men, we ſay, are obliged, under pain of Damnation, to ſeek the true ſenſe of it, and not to wreſt it to their preconceived Phanſies. Such a Law therefore to ſuch men cannot but be very fit to end all Controverſies, neceſſary to be ended. For others that are not ſo, they will end when the World ends, and that is time enough.

13. Your

13. Your next encounter is with them, who acknowledging the Scripture a Rule only and not a Judge, make the Holy Ghoſt, ſpeaking in Scripture, the judge of Controverſies. Which you diſprove by ſaying, *That the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking only in Scripture is no more intelligible to us, than the Scripture in which he ſpeaks.* But by this reaſon neither the *Pope*, nor a Council can be a Judge neither. For firſt, denying the Scriptures, the writings of the Holy Ghoſt, to be Judges, you will not I hope offer to pretend, that their decrees, the writings of men are more capable of this function: the ſame exceptions at leaſt, if not more, and greater lying againſt them as do againſt Scripture. And then what you Object againſt the Holy Ghoſt, ſpeaking in Scripture, to exclude him from this office, The ſame I return upon them and their decrees, to debar them from it; that they ſpeaking unto us only in their decrees, are no more intelligible than the decrees in which they ſpeak. And therefore if the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking in Scripture may not be a judge for this reaſon; neither may they, ſpeaking in their decrees, be Judges for the ſame Reaſon. *If the* Popes *decrees* (you will ſay) *be obſcure, he can explain himſelf, and ſo the Scripture cannot.* But the Holy Ghoſt, that ſpeaks in Scripture, can do ſo, if he pleaſe, and when he is pleaſed will do ſo. In the mean time it will be fit for you to wait his leiſure, and to be content, that thoſe things of Scripture which are plain ſhould be ſo, and thoſe which are obſcure ſhould remain obſcure, until he pleaſe to declare them. Beſides he can (which you cannot warrant me of the *Pope* or a Coucil) ſpeak at firſt ſo plainly, that his Words ſhall need no farther explanation; and ſo in things neceſſary we believe he has done. And if you ſay, *the Decrees of Councils touching Controverſies, though they be not the Judge, yet they are the Judges Sentence:* So, I ſay, the Scripture, though not the Judge, is the Sentence of the Judge. When therefore you conclude, *That to ſay a Judge is neceſſary for deciding Controverſies, about the meaning of Scripture, is as much as to ſay, he is neceſſary to decide what the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaks in Scripture:*

ture: This I grant is true, but I may not grant that a Judge (ſuch a one as we diſpute of) is neceſſary either to do the one, or the other. For if the Scripture (as it is in things neceſſary) be plain, why ſhould it be more neceſſary to have a judge to interpret them in plain places, than to have a judge to interpret the meaning of a Councils decrees, and others to interpret their Interpretations, and others to interpret theirs, and ſo on for ever? And where they are not plain, there if we, uſing diligence to find the truth, do yet miſs of it and fall into Error, there is no danger in it. They that Err, and they that do not Err may both be ſaved. So that thoſe places which contain things neceſſary, and wherein Error were dangerous, need no Infallible interpreter becauſe they are plain: and thoſe that are obſcure need none becauſe they contain not things neceſſary, neither is Error in them dangerous.

The Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law, I grant it, *is no more eaſily underſtood than the Law it ſelf*, for his Speech is nothing elſe but the Law: I grant it *very neceſſary, that beſides the Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law, there ſhould be other Judges to determine Civil and Criminal Controverſies, and to give every man that Juſtice which the Law allows him.* But your Argument drawn from hence to ſhew a neceſſity of a viſible Judge in Controverſies of Religion I ſay is Sophiſtical: and that for many Reaſons.

14. Firſt, Becauſe the variety of Civil caſes is infinite, and therefore there cannot be poſſibly Laws enough provided for the determination of them: and therefore there muſt be a Judge to ſupply out of the Principles of Reaſon the interpretation of the Law, where it is defective. But the Scripture (we ſay) is a perfect Rule of Faith, and therefore needs no ſupply of the defects of it.

15. Secondly, To execute the Letter of the Law, according to rigour, would be many times unjuſt, and therefore there is need of a Judge to moderate it; whereof in Religion there is no uſe at all.

16. Thirdly, In Civil and Criminal cauſes the parties have for the moſt part ſo much intereſt, and very often ſo little honeſty, that they will not ſubmit to a Law though never

never ſo plain, if it be againſt them; or will not ſee it to be againſt them, though it be ſo never ſo plainly: whereas if men were honeſt, and the Law were plain and extended to all caſes, there would be little need of Judges. Now in matters of Religion, when the Queſtion is, whether every man be a fit Judge and chooſer for himſelf, we ſuppoſe men honeſt, and ſuch as underſtand the difference between a Moment and Eternity. And ſuch men, we conceive, will think it highly concerns them to be of the true Religion, but nothing at all that this or that Religion ſhould be the true. And then we ſuppoſe that all the neceſſary points of Religion are plain and eaſie, and conſequently every man in this cauſe to be a competent Judge for himſelf; becauſe it concerns himſelf to judge right as much as Eternal happineſs is worth. And if through his own default he judge amiſs he alone ſhall ſuffer for it.

17. Fourthly, in Civil Controverſies we are obliged only to external paſſive obedience, and not to an internal and active. We are bound to obey the Sentence of the Judge, or not to reſiſt it, but not always to believe it juſt. But in matters of Religion, ſuch a Judge is required whom we ſhould be obliged to believe, to have judged right. So that in Civil Controverſies every honeſt underſtanding man is fit to be a Judge; But in Religion none but he that is infallible.

18. Fifthly, in Civil Cauſes there is means and power, when the Judge has decreed, to compel men to obey his Sentence: otherwiſe, I believe, Laws alone, would be to as much purpoſe, for the ending of differences, as Laws and Judges both. But all the Power in the World is neither fit to convince, nor able to compel a mans Conſcience to conſent to any thing. Worldly terror may prevail ſo far as to make men profeſs a Religion which they believe not, (ſuch men I mean, who know not that there is a Heaven provided for Martyrs, and a Hell for thoſe that diſſemble ſuch truths as are neceſſary to be profeſſed:) But to force, either any man to believe what he believes not, or any honeſt man to diſſemble what he does believe

(if

(if God commands him to profeſs it,) or to profeſs what he does not believe, all the Powers in the World are too weak, with all the Powers of Hell, to aſſiſt them.

19. Sixthly, in Civil Controverſies the caſe cannot be ſo put, but there may be a Judge to end it, who is not a party: In Controverſies of Religion, it is in a manner impoſſible to be avoided but the Judge muſt be a party. For this muſt be the firſt, whether he be a Judge or no, and in that he muſt be a party. Sure I am, the *Pope*, in the Controverſies of our time, is a chief party; for it highly concerns him, even as much as his Popedom is worth, not to yield any one point of his Religion to be Erroneous. And he is a man ſubject to like paſſions with other men. And therefore we may juſtly decline his Sentence, for fear temporal reſpects ſhould either blind his judgment, or make him pronounce againſt it.

20. Seventhly, in Civil Controverſies, it is impoſſible *Titius* ſhould hold the land in queſtion and *Sempronius* too: and therefore either the Plantiff muſt injure the Defendant, by diſquieting his poſſeſſion, or the Defendant wrong the Plantiff by keeping his right from him. But in Controverſies of Religion the Caſe is otherwiſe. I may hold my Opinion and do you no wrong, and you yours and do me none. Nay we may both of us hold our Opinion, and yet do our ſelves no harm; provided, the difference be not touching any thing neceſſary to Salvation, and that we love truth ſo well, as to be diligent to inform our Conſcience, and conſtant in following it.

21. Eightly, For the ending of Civil Controverſies, who does not ſee it is abſolutely neceſſary, that not only Judges ſhould be appointed, but that it ſhould be known and unqueſtioned who they are? Thus all the Judges of our Land are known men, known to be Judges, and no man can doubt or queſtion, but theſe are the Men. Otherwiſe if it were a diſputable thing, who were theſe Judges, and they had no certain warrant for their Authority, but only ſome Topical congruities, would not any man ſay ſuch Judges, in all likelihood, would rather multiply Controverſies, then end them?

22. Ninthly, and laſtly, For the deciding of Civil Controverſies men may appoint themſelves a judge. But in matters of Religion, this office may be given to none but whom God hath deſigned for it: who doth not always give us thoſe things which we conceive moſt expedient for our ſelves.

23. So likewiſe if our Saviour, the King of Heaven, had intended that all Controverſies in Religion ſhould be by ſome Viſible Judge finally determined, who can doubt, but in plain terms he would have expreſſed himſelf about this matter? He would have ſaid plainly. *The Biſhop of* Rome *I have appointed to decide all emergent Controverſies.* For that our Saviour deſigned the *Biſhop of Rome* to this Office, and yet would not ſay ſo, nor cauſe it to be written--*ad Rei memoriam*---by any of the *Evangeliſts* or *Apoſtles*, ſo much as once; but leave it to be drawn out of uncertain Principles, by thirteen or fourteen more uncertain conſequences, He that can believe it, let him. All theſe Reaſons, I hope, will convince you, that though we have, and have great neceſſity of, Judges in Civil and Criminal cauſes: yet you may not conclude from thence, that there is any publick authorized Judge to determine Controverſies in Religion, nor any neceſſity there ſhould be any.

24. *But the Scripture ſtands in need of ſome watchful and unerring eye to guard it, by means of whoſe aſſured vigilancy we may undoubtedly receive it ſincere and pure.* Very true, but this is no other than the watchful Eye of Divine providence: the goodneſs whereof will never ſuffer, that the Scriptures ſhould be depraved and corrupted, but that in them ſhould be always extant a conſpicuous and plain way to Eternal happineſs. Neither can any thing be more palpably unconſiſtent with his goodneſs, than to ſuffer Scripture to be undiſcernably corrupted in any matter of moment, and yet to exact of men the belief of thoſe verities, which without their fault, or knowledge, or poſſibility of prevention, were defaced out of them. So that God requiring of men to believe Scripture in its purity, ingages himſelf to ſee it preſerved in ſufficient purity, and you need not fear but he will ſatisfie his ingagement.

You

You ſay, *we can have no aſſurance of this but your Churches Vigilancy.* But if we had no other we were in a hard caſe; for who could then aſſure us that your Church has been ſo vigilant, as to guard Scripture from any the leaſt alteration? There being various Lections in the ancient Copies of your Bibles, what ſecurity can your new raiſed *Office of Aſſurance* give us, that, that reading is true which you now receive, and that falſe which you reject? Certainly they that anciently received and made uſe of theſe divers Copies, were not all guarded by the Churches vigilancy from having their Scripture altered from the purity of the Original in many places. For of different readings, it is not in nature impoſſible that all ſhould be falſe, but more than one cannot poſſibly be true. Yet the want of ſuch a protection was no hindrance to their Salvation, and why then ſhall the having of it be neceſſary for ours? But then this Vigilancy of your Church, what means have we to be aſcertain'd of it? Firſt, the thing is not evident of it ſelf; which is evident, becauſe many do not believe it. Neither can any thing be pretended to give evidence to it, but only ſome places of Scripture; of whoſe incorruption more than any other what is it that can ſecure me? If you ſay the Churches vigilancy, you are in a Circle, proving the Scriptures uncorrupted by the Churches vigilancy, and the Churches vigilancy by the incorruption of ſome places of Scripture, and again the incorruption of thoſe places by the Churches vigilancy. If you name any other means, than that means which ſecures me of the Scriptures incorruption in thoſe places, will alſo ſerve to aſſure me of the ſame in other places. For my part, abſtracting from Divine Providence, which will never ſuffer the way to Heaven to be blocked up or made inviſible, I know no other means (I mean no other natural and rational means) to be aſſured hereof, than I have that any other Book is uncorrupted. For though I have a greater degree of rational and humane Aſſurance of that than this, in regard of divers conſiderations which make it more credible, *That the Scripture hath been preſerved from any material alteration*; yet my aſſurance of

both is of the ſame kind and condition, both Moral aſſurances, and neither Phyſical or Mathematical.

25. To the next argument the Reply is obvious; *That though we do not believe the Books of Scripture to be Canonical becauſe they ſay ſo,* (For other Books that are not Canonical may ſay they are, and thoſe that are ſo may ſay nothing of it:) yet we believe not this upon the Authority of your Church, but upon the Credibility of *Univerſal Tradition,* which is a thing *Credible of it ſelf,* and therefore fit to be reſted on; whereas the Authority of your Church is not ſo. And therefore your reſt thereon is not rational but meerly voluntary. I might as well reſt upon the judgment of the next man I meet, or upon a chance of a Lottery for it. For by this means I only know I might Err, but by relying on you I know I ſhould Err. But yet (to return you one ſuppoſe for another) ſuppoſe I ſhould for this and all other things ſubmit to her direction, how could ſhe aſſure me that I ſhould not be miſ-led by doing ſo? She pretends indeed infallibility herein, but how can ſhe aſſure us that ſhe hath it? What, by Scriptures. That you ſay cannot aſſure us of its own Infallibility, and therefore not of yours. What then, by Reaſon? That you ſay may deceive in other things, and why not in this? How then will ſhe aſſure us hereof, By ſaying ſo? Of this very affirmation there will remain the ſame Queſtion ſtill, How it can prove it ſelf to be infallibly true. Neither can there be an end of the like multiplied Demands, till we reſt in ſomething evident of it ſelf, which demonſtrates to the World that this Church is infallible. And ſeeing there is no ſuch Rock for the Infallibility of this Church to be ſetled on, it muſt of neceſſity, like the Iſland of *Delos,* flote up and down for ever. And yet upon this point according to *Papiſts* all other Controverſies in Faith depend.

26. To the 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, §.] The ſum and ſubſtance of the Ten next Paragraphs is this, *That it appears, by the Confeſſions of ſome* Proteſtants, *and the Contentions of others, that the Queſtions about the Canon of Scripture, what it is: and about the Various reading and Tranſla-*

Tranſlations of it, which is true and which not, are not to be determined by Scripture, and therefore that all Controverſies of Religion are not decidable by Scripture.

27. To which I have already anſwered ſaying, That when Scripture is affirmed to be the rule by which all Controverſies of Religion are to be decided, Thoſe are to be excepted out of this generality which are concerning the Scripture it ſelf. For as that general ſaying of Scripture, *He hath put all things under his Feet*, is moſt true, though yet S. *Paul* tells us, *That when it is ſaid, he hath put all things under him, it is manifeſt he is excepted who did put all things under him:* So when we ſay that all Controverſies of Religion are decidable by the Scripture, it is manifeſt to all, but *Cavillers*, that we do and muſt except from this generality, thoſe which are *touching the Scripture it ſelf.* Juſt as a Merchant ſhewing a Ship of his own, may ſay, all my ſubſtance is in this Ship; and yet never intended to deny, that his Ship is part of his ſubſtance, nor yet to ſay that his Ship is in it ſelf. Or as a man may ſay, that a whole Houſe is ſupported by the Foundation, and yet never mean to exclude the Foundation from being a part of the Houſe, or to ſay that it is ſupported by it ſelf. Or as you your ſelves uſe to ſay, that the Biſhop of *Rome* is head of the whole Church, and yet would think us but Captious Sophiſters ſhould we infer from hence, that either you made him no part of the whole, or elſe made him head of himſelf. Your negative concluſion therefore, that theſe *Queſtions touching Scripture, are not decidable by Scripture*, you needed not have cited any Authorities, nor urged any reaſon to prove it; it is evident of it ſelf, and I grant it without more ado. But your Corollary from it, which you would inſinuate to your unwary reader, *that therefore they are to be decided by your, or any Viſible Church*, is a meer inconſequence, and very like his collection, who becauſe *Pamphilus* was not to have *Glycerium* for his Wife, preſently concluded that he muſt have her; as if there had been no more men in the World but *Pamphilus* and himſelf. For ſo you as if there were nothing in the World capable of this Office, but the Scripture,

Scripture, or the preſent Church, having concluded againſt Scripture, you conceive, but too haſtily, that you have concluded for the Church. But the truth is, neither the one nor the other have any thing to do with this matter. For firſt, the Queſtion *whether ſuch or ſuch a Book be Canonical Scripture*, though it may be decided negatively out of Scripture, by ſhewing apparent and irreconcilable contradictions between it and ſome other Book confeſſedly Canonical; yet affirmatively it cannot but only by the Teſtimonies of the ancient Churches: any Book being to be received as undoubtedly Canonical, or to be doubted of as uncertain, or rejected as Apocryphal, according as it was received, or doubted of, or rejected by them. Then for the Queſtion, *of various readings which is the true*, it is in reaſon evident and confeſſed by your own *Pope*, that there is no poſſible determination of it, but only by compariſon with ancient Copies. And laſtly for Controverſies about different Tranſlations of Scripture, the Learned have the ſame means to ſatisfie themſelves in it, as in the Queſtions which happen about the Tranſlation of any other Author, that is, skill in the Language of the Original, and comparing Tranſlations with it. In which way if there be no certainty, I would know what certainty you have, that your *Doway* Old, and *Rhemiſh* New *Teſtament* are true Tranſlations? And then for the unlearned thoſe on your Side are ſubject to as much, nay the very ſame uncertainty with thoſe on ours. Neither is there any reaſon imaginable, why an ignorant *Engliſh Proteſtant* may not be as ſecure of the Tranſlation of our Church, that it is free from Error, if not abſolutely, yet in matters of moment, as an ignorant *Engliſh Papiſt* can be of his *Rhemiſh Teſtament*, or *Doway Bible*. The beſt direction I can give them is to compare both together, & where there is no real difference (as in the Tranſlation of controverted places I believe there is very little) there to be confident, that they are right; where they differ, therefore to be prudent in the choice of the guides they follow. Which way of proceeding, if it be ſubject to ſome poſſible Error, is it the beſt that either we, or you have; and it is not required that we uſe any better than the beſt we have.

28. You

28. You will ſay, *Dependance on your Churches infallibility is a better.* I anſwer, it would be ſo, if we could be infallibly certain, that your Church is infallible, that is, if it were either evident of it ſelf, and ſeen by its own light, or could be reduced unto and ſetled upon ſome Principle that is ſo. But ſeeing you your ſelves do not ſo much as pretend, to enforce us to the belief hereof, by any proofs infallible and convincing, but only to induce us to it, by ſuch as are, by your confeſſion, only probable, and *prudential motives*; certainly it will be to very little purpoſe, to put off your uncertainty for the firſt turn, and to fall upon it at the ſecond: to pleaſe your ſelves in building your Houſe upon an imaginary Rock, when you your ſelves ſee and confeſs, that this very Rock ſtands it ſelf at the beſt but upon a frame of Timber. I anſwer ſecondly, that this cannot be a better way, becauſe we are infallibly certain that your Church is not infallible, and indeed hath not the real preſcription of this priviledge, but only pleaſeth her ſelf with a falſe imagination and vain preſumption of it: as I ſhall hereafter demonſtrate by may unanſwerable arguments.

31. But, *ſeeing the belief of the Scripture is a neceſſary thing, and cannot be proved by Scripture, how can the Church of* England *teach, as ſhe doth, Art. 6. That all things neceſſary are contained in Scripture?*

32. I have anſwered this already. And here again I ſay, That all but Cavillers will eaſily underſtand the meaning of the Article to be, That all the Divine Verities, which Chriſt revealed to his Apoſtles, and the Apoſtles taught the Churches, are contained in Scripture. That is, all the material Objects of our Faith; whereof the Scripture is none, but only the means of conveying them unto us: which we believe not finally, and for it ſelf, but for the matter contained in it. So that if men did believe the Doctrine contained in Scripture, it ſhould no way hinder their Salvation, not to know whether their were any Scripture or no. Thoſe Barbarous Nations *Irenæus* ſpeaks of were in this caſe, and yet no doubt but they might be ſaved. The end that God aims at, is the belief of the Goſpel,

the

the Covenant between God and Man; the Scripture he hath provided as a means for this end, and this alſo we are to believe, but not as the laſt Object of our Faith, but as the inſtrument of it. When therefore we ſubſcribe to the 6. *Art.* you muſt underſtand that, by *Articles of Faith*, they mean the final and ultimate Objects of it, and not the means and inſtrumental Objects;

33. But, *Proteſtants agree not in aſſigning the Canon of Holy Scripture.* Luther *and* Illyricus *reject the Epiſtle of S.* James. Kemnitius, *and other Luth. the ſecond of* Peter, *the ſecond and third of* John. *The Epiſtle to the* Heb. *the Epiſtle of* James, *of* Jude, *and the Apocalyps. Therefore without the Authority of the Church, no certainty can be had what Scripture is Canonical.*

34. So alſo the *Ancient Fathers*, and not only Fathers, but *whole Churches* differed about the certainty of the Authority of the very ſame Books: and by their difference ſhewed, they knew no neceſſity of conforming themſelves herein to the judgment of your or any Church. For had they done ſo, they muſt have agreed all with that Church, and conſequently among themſelves. Now I pray tell me plainly, Had they ſufficient certainty what Scripture was Canonical, or had they not? If they had not, it ſeems there is no ſuch great harm or danger in not having ſuch a certainty whether ſome Books be Canonical or no, as you require: If they had, why may not *Proteſtants*, notwithſtanding their differences, have ſufficient certainty hereof, as well as the Ancient Fathers and Churches, notwithſtanding theirs?

35. You proceed. And whereas the *Proteſtants* of *England* in the 6. *Art.* have theſe Words, *In the name of the Holy Scripture we do underſtand thoſe Books, of whoſe Authority was never any doubt in the Church*; you demand, *what they mean by them? Whether that by the Churches conſent they are aſſured what Scriptures be Canonical?* I Anſwer for them. Yes, they are ſo. And whereas you infer from hence, *This is to make the Church Judge*: I have told you already, That *of this Controverſie we make the Church the Judge*; but not the preſent Church, much leſs the

the preſent *Roman* Church, but the conſent and Teſtimony of the *Ancient and Primitive Church.* Which though it be but a highly probable inducement, and no demonſtrative enforcement, yet methinks you ſhould not deny but it may be a ſufficient ground of Faith: Whoſe Faith, even of the Foundation of all your Faith, your Churches Authority, is built laſtly and wholly upon *Prudential Motives.*

36. But *by this Rule the whole Book of* Eſther *muſt quit the Canon; becauſe it was excluded by ſome in the Church:* by *Melito, Athanaſius,* and *Gregory Nazianzen.* Then for ought I know he that ſhould think he had reaſon to exclude it now, might be ſtill in the Church as well as *Melito, Athanaſius, Nazianzen* were. And while you thus inveigh againſt *Luther,* and charge him with Luciferian Hereſies, for doing that which you in this very place confeſs that Saints in Heaven before him have done, *are you not partial and a Judge of evil thoughts?*

37. *Luther's* cenſures of *Eccleſiaſtes, Job,* and the *Prophets,* though you make ſuch Tragedies with them, I ſee none of them but is capable of a tolerable conſtruction, and far from having in them any Fundamental Hereſie. He that condemns him for ſaying, the Book of *Eccleſiaſtes is not full, That it hath many abrupt things,* condemns him, for ought I can ſee, for ſpeaking truth. And the reſt of the cenſure is but a bold and blunt expreſſion of the ſame thing. The Book of *Job* may be a true Hiſtory, and yet as many true Stories are, and have been an Argument of a Fable to ſet before us an example of Patience. And though the Books of the Prophets were not written by themſelves, but by their Diſciples, yet it does not follow that they were written caſually: (Though I hope you will not damn all for Hereticks, that ſay, ſome Books of Scripture were written caſually.) Neither is there any reaſon they ſhould the ſooner be called in queſtion for being written by their Diſciples, ſeeing being ſo written they had atteſtation from themſelves. Was the Propheſie of *Jeremy* the leſs Canonical, for being written by *Baruch*? Or becauſe S. *Peter* the Maſter dictated the

Goſpel, and S. *Mark* the Scholar writ it, is it the more likely to be called in Queſtion?

38. But leaving *Luther*, you return to our *Engliſh* Canon of Scripture; And tell us, that in *the New Teſtament, by the above mentioned rule, (of whoſe Authority was never any doubt in the Church) divers Books muſt be diſcanonized.* Not ſo. For I may believe even thoſe queſtioned Books to have been written by the Apoſtles and to be Canonical: but I cannot in Reaſon believe this of them ſo undoubtedly, as of *thoſe Books which were never queſtioned.* At leaſt I have no warrant to damn any man that ſhall doubt of them or deny them now: having the example of Saints in Heaven, either to juſtifie, or excuſe ſuch their doubting or denial.

39. You obſerve in the next place, that *our ſixth Article, ſpecifying by name all the Books of the* Old Teſtament, *ſhuffles over theſe of the* New *with this generality -- All the Books of the* New Teſtament, *as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical:* And in this you fancy to your ſelf *a myſtery of iniquity.* But if this be all the ſhuffling that the Church of *England* is guilty of, I believe the Church, as well as the King, may give for her Motto, *Honi ſoit qui mal y penſe.* For all the Bibles which ſince the Compoſing of the Articles have been uſed and allowed by the *Church of England*, do teſtifie and even proclaim to the World, that by -- *Commonly received*, they meant, *received by the Church of* Rome, *and other Churches before the Reformation.* I pray take the pains to look in them, and there you ſhall find the Books which the Church of *England* counts Apocryphal marked out and ſevered from the reſt, with this Title in the beginning, *The Books called Apocrypha*; and with this cloſe or Seal in the End, *The End of the Apocrypha.* And having told you by name, and in particular, what Books only She Eſteems *Apocryphal*, I hope you will not put Her to the trouble of telling you that the reſt are in Her judgment *Canonical.*

40. *But if by Commonly received, She meant, by the Church of* Rome; *Then by the ſame reaſon, muſt She receive divers Books of the* Old Teſtament *which She rejects.* Cer-

41. Certainly a very good Conſequence. The Church of *England* receives the Books of the *New Teſtament*, which the Church of *Rome* receives; Therefore ſhe muſt receive the Books of the *Old Teſtament* which ſhe receives. As if you ſhould ſay, If you will do as we, in one thing, you muſt in all things. If you will pray to God with us, you muſt pray to Saints with us. If you hold with us, when we have reaſon on our ſide, you muſt de ſo, when we have no reaſon.

43. But, *with what Coherence can we ſay in the former part of the Article, That by Scripture we mean thoſe Books that were never doubted of; and in the latter ſay, We receive all the Books of the* New Teſtament, *as they are commonly received, whereas of them many were doubted?* I anſwer. When they ſay, *of whoſe Authority there was never any doubt in the Church*, They mean not, thoſe only of whoſe Authority there was ſimply no doubt at all, by any man in the Church; But ſuch as were not at any time doubted of by the whole Church, or by all Churches, but had atteſtation, though not Univerſal, yet at leaſt ſufficient to make conſidering men receive them for Canonical. In which number they may well reckon thoſe Epiſtles which were ſometimes doubted of by ſome, yet whoſe number and Authority was not ſo great, as to prevail againſt the contrary ſuffrages.

44. But, *if to be commonly received, paſs for a good Rule to know the Canon of the* New Teſtament *by, why not of the Old?* You conclude many times very well, but ſtill when you do ſo, it is out of principles which no man grants. For who ever told you, that to be *commonly* received is a good Rule to know the Canon of the *New Teſtament* by? Have you been trained up in Schools of ſubtilty, and cannot you ſee a great difference, between theſe two, We receive the Books of the *New Teſtament as they are* commonly received, and we receive thoſe that are commonly received, *becauſe they are ſo?* To ſay this, were indeed to make, *being commonly received*, a Rule or Reaſon to know the Canon by. But to ſay the former, doth no more make it a Rule, than you ſhould make the Church of *England* the rule of your receiving them, if you ſhould

ſay, as you may, The Books of the *New Teſtament* we receive for Canonical, as they are received by the Church of *England*.

45. You demand, *upon what infallible ground we agree with* Luther *againſt you, in ſome, and with you againſt* Luther *in others*? And I alſo demand upon what infallible ground you hold your Canon, and agree neither with us, nor *Luther*? For ſure your differing from us both, is of it ſelf no more apparently reaſonable, than our agreeing with you in part, and in part with *Luther*. If you ſay, your Churches Infallibility is your ground: I demand again ſome Infallible ground both for the Churches Infallibility, and for this, that *Yours is the Church*; and ſhall never ceaſe multiplying demands upon demands, until you ſettle me upon a Rock; I mean, give ſuch an anſwer, whoſe Truth is ſo evident that it needs no further evidence. If you ſay, *This is Univerſal Tradition*: I reply, your Churches Infallibility is not built upon it, and that the Canon of Scripture, as we receive it, is. For we do not profeſs our ſelves ſo abſolutely, and undoubtedly certain; neither do we urge others to be ſo, of thoſe Books, which have been doubted, as of thoſe that never have.

46. The Concluſion of your Tenth. §. is, That *the Divinity of a writing cannot be known from it ſelf alone, but by ſome extrinſecal Authority*: Which you need not prove, for no Wiſe Man denies it. But then this authority is that of *Univerſal Tradition*, not of your Church. For to me it is altogether as ἀνόητον, that the Goſpel of *Saint Matthew* is the Word of God, as that all which your Church ſays is true.

47. That Believers of the Scripture, by conſidering the Divine matter, the excellent precepts, the glorious promiſes contained in it, may be confirmed in their Faith, of the Scriptures Divine Authority; and that among other inducements and inforcements hereunto, internal arguments have their place and force, certainly no man of underſtandeng can deny. For my part I profeſs, if the Doctrine of the Scripture were not as good, and as fit to come from the Fountain of goodneſs, as the

the Miracles, by which it was confirmed, were great, I ſhould want one main pillar of my Faith, and for want of it, I fear ſhould be much ſtaggered in it. Now this and nothing elſe did the *Doctor* mean in ſaying, *The Believer ſees, by that glorious beam of Divine light which ſhines in Scripture, and by many internal Arguments, that the Scripture is of Divine Authority. By this* (ſaith he) *he ſees it*, that is, he is moved to, and ſtrengthened in his belief of it: and by this partly, not wholly; by this, not alone, but with the concurrence of other Arguments. He that will quarrel with him for ſaying ſo, muſt find fault with the *Maſter of the Sentences*, and all his *Scholars*, for they all ſay the ſame.

48. In the next Diviſion, out of your liberality, you will ſuppoſe, that Scripture, like to a corporal light, is *by it ſelf alone* able to determine and move our underſtanding to aſſent: yet notwithſtanding this ſuppoſal, *Faith ſtill* (you ſay) *muſt go before Scripture, becauſe as the light is viſible only to thoſe that have eyes: ſo the Scripture only to thoſe that have the Eye of Faith.* But to my underſtanding, if Scripture do move and determine our Underſtanding to aſſent, then the Scripture, and its moving muſt be before this aſſent, as the cauſe muſt be before its own effect; now this very aſſent is nothing elſe but Faith, and Faith nothing elſe than the Underſtandings aſſent. And therefore (upon this ſuppoſal) Faith doth, and muſt originally proceed from Scripture, as the effect from its proper cauſe: and the influence and efficacy of Scripture is to be preſuppoſed before the aſſent of Faith, unto which it moves and determines, and conſequently if this ſuppoſition of yours were true, there ſhould need no other means precedent to Scripture to beget Faith, Scripture it ſelf being able (as here you ſuppoſe) to determine and move the underſtanding to aſſent, that is to believe them, and the Verities contained in them. Neither is this to ſay, that the Eyes with which we ſee, are made by the light by which we ſee. For you are miſtaken much, if you conceive that in this compariſon, Faith anſwers to the Eye. But if you will not pervert it, the Analogy muſt

muſt ſtand thus-; Scripture muſt anſwer to light; The Eye of the Soul, that is the Underſtanding, or the faculty of aſſenting, to the bodily Eye; And laſtly aſſenting or believing to the Act of ſeeing. As therefore the light, determining the Eye to ſee, though it preſuppoſes the Eye which it determines, as every Action doth the Object on which it is imployed, yet it ſelf is preſuppoſed and antecedent to the Act of ſeeing, as the cauſe is always to its effect: So, if you will ſuppoſe that Scripture, like light, moves the underſtanding to aſſent, The Underſtanding (that's the Eye and Object on which it works) muſt be before this influence upon it; But the Aſſent, that is the belief whereof the Scripture moves, and the underſtanding is moved, which anſwers to the Act of ſeeing, muſt come after. For if it did aſſent already, to what purpoſe ſhould the Scripture do that which was done before? Nay indeed how were it poſſible it ſhould be ſo, any more than a Father can beget a Son that he hath already? Or an Architect build an Houſe that is built already? Or than this very world can be made again before it be unmade? Tranſubſtantiation indeed is fruitful of ſuch Monſters. But they that have not ſworn themſelves to the defence of Error, will eaſily perceive, that *Jam factum facere*, and *Factum infectum facere*, are equally impoſſible. But I digreſs.

49. The cloſe of this Paragraph, is a fit cover for ſuch a Diſh. There you tell us, That *if there muſt be ſome other means precedent to Scripture to beget Faith, this can be no other than the Church.* By the Church, we know you do, and muſt underſtand the *Roman Church*: ſo that in effect you ſay, no man can have Faith, but he muſt be moved to it by your Churches Authority. And that is to ſay, that the King and all other *Proteſtants*, to whom you write, though they verily think they are Chriſtians and believe the Goſpel, becauſe they aſſent to the truth of it, and would willingly Die for it, yet indeed are Infidels and believe nothing. The Scripture tells us, *The Heart of man knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of Man which is in him.* And who are you, to take upon you to make us believe

believe, that we do not believe, what we know we do? But if I may think verily that I believe the Scripture, and yet not believe it; how know you that you believe the *Roman Church*? I am as verily, and as ſtrongly perſuaded that I believe the Scripture, as you are that you believe the Church. And if I may be deceived, why may not you? Again, what more ridiculous, and againſt ſenſe and experience, than to affirm, That there are not Millions amongſt you and us that believe, upon no other reaſon than their Education, and the authority of their Parents and Teachers, and the Opinion they have of them? The tenderneſs of the ſubject, and aptneſs to receive impreſſions, ſupplying the defect and imperfection of the Agent! And will you proſcribe from Heaven all thoſe believers of your own Creed, who do indeed lay the Foundation of their Faith (for I cannot call it by any other name) no deeper than upon the Authority of their Father, or Maſter, or Pariſh Prieſt? Certainly, if theſe have no true Faith, your Church is very full of Infidels. Suppoſe *Xaverius* by the Holineſs of his Life had converted ſome *Indians* to Chriſtianity, who could (for ſo I will ſuppoſe) have no knowledge of your Church but from him, and therefore muſt laſt of all build their Faith of the Church upon their Opinion of *Xaverius*: Do theſe remain as very *Pagans* after their Converſion, as they were before? Are they brought to aſſent in their Souls, and obey in their Lives the Goſpel of Chriſt, only to be Tantalized and not ſaved, and not benefited but deluded by it, becauſe, forſooth, it is a man and not the Church that begets Faith in them? What if their motive to believe be not in reaſon ſufficient? Do they therefore not believe what they do believe, becauſe they do it upon ſufficient motives? They chooſe the Faith imprudently parhaps, but yet they do chooſe it. Unleſs you will have us believe that, that which is done, is not done, becauſe it is not done upon good reaſon: which is to ſay, that never any man living ever did a fooliſh action. But yet I know not why the Authority of one Holy Man, which apparently has no ends upon me, joyned with the

goodneſs

goodneſs of the Chriſtian Faith, might not be a far greater and more rational motive to me to embrace Chriſtianity, than any I can have to continue in *Paganiſm*. And therefore for ſhame, if not for Love of Truth, you muſt recant this fancy when you write again: and ſuffer true Faith to be many times, where your Churches Infallibility has no hand in the begetting of it. And be content to tell us hereafter, that we believe not enough, and not go about to perſuade us, we believe nothing, for fear with telling us what we know to be manifeſtly falſe, you ſhould gain only this, *Not to be believed when you ſpeak truth.* Some pretty Sophiſms you may happily bring us to make us believe, we believe nothing: but Wiſe men know that Reaſon againſt Experience is alwaies Sophiſtical. And therefore as he that could not anſwer *Zeno's* ſubtilties againſt the exiſtence of Motion, could yet confute them by doing that, which he pretended could not be done: So if you ſhould give me a hundred Arguments to perſuade me, becauſe I do not believe Tranſubſtantiation, I do not believe in God, and the *Knots* of them I could not unty, yet I ſhould cut them in pieces with doing that, and knowing that I do ſo, which you pretend I cannot do.

53. It is ſuperfluous for you to prove *out of* S. Athanaſius, *and* Auſtine *that we muſt receive the ſacred Canon upon the credit of Gods Church.* Underſtanding by Church, as here you explain your ſelf, *The Credit of Tradition.* And that not the Tradition of the Preſent Church, which we pretend may deviate from the Ancient, but *ſuch a Tradidition, which involves an evidence of Fact, and from Hand to Hand, from Age to Age, bringing us up to the times and Perſons of the Apoſtles, and our Saviour Himſelf, commeth to be confirmed by all theſe Miracles, and other Arguments, whereby they convinced their Doctrine to be true.* Thus you. Now prove the Canon of Scripture which you receive by ſuch Tradition and we will allow it. Prove your whole Doctrine, or the Infallibility of your Church by ſuch a Tradition, and we will yield to you in all things. Take the alledged places of S. *Athanaſius*, and S. *Auſtin*, in this ſenſe,

ſenſe, (which is your own,) and they will not preſs us any thing at all. We will ſay, with *Athanaſius, That only four Goſpels are to be received, becauſe the Canons of the Holy and* Catholick *Church* (underſtand of *all Ages* ſince the perfection of the Canon) *have ſo determined.*

54. We will ſubſcribe to S. *Auſtin*, and ſay, That *we alſo would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Catholick Church did move us,* (meaning by the Church, *the Church of all Ages,* and that ſucceſſion of Chriſtians which takes in *Chriſt himſelf* and his *Apoſtles.*) Neither would *Zwinglius* have needed to cry out upon this ſaying, had he conceived as you now do, that by the Catholick Church, the Church of all Ages, ſince Chriſt, was to be underſtood. As for the Council of *Carthage*, it may ſpeak not of ſuch Books only, as were certainly Canonical, and for the regulating of Faith, but alſo of thoſe which were only profitable, and lawful to be read in the Church. Which in *England* is a very ſlender Argument that the Book is Canonical, where every body knows that Apocryphal Books are read as well as Canonical. But howſoever, if you underſtand by Fathers, not only their immediate Fathers and Predeceſſors in the Goſpel, but the ſucceſſion of them from the Apoſtles; they are right in the Theſis, that *whatſoever is received from theſe Fathers, as Canonical, is to be ſo eſteemed*; Though in the application of it, to this or that particular Book they may happily Err, and think that Book received as Canonical, which was only received as Profitable to be read; and think that Book, received alwaies, and by all, which was rejected by ſome, and doubted of by many.

55. *But we cannot be certain, in what Language the Scriptures remain uncorrupted.* CHIL. Not ſo certain, I grant, as of that which we can demonſtrate: But certain enough, morally certain, as certain as the nature of the thing will bear. So certain we may be, and God requires no more. We may be as certain as S. *Auſtin* was, who in his *ſecond Book of Baptiſm, againſt the Donatiſts, c.* 3. plainly implies, *the Scripture might poſſibly be corrupted.* He means ſure in matters of little moment, ſuch as con-

certain not the Covenant between God and Man. But thus he ſaith. The ſame S. *Auſtin* in his 48. *Epiſt.* clearly intimates, [a] That *in his judgment, the only preſervative of the Scriptures integrity, was the Tranſlating it into ſo many Languages, and the general and perpetual uſe and reading of it in the Church: for want whereof the works of particular Doctors were more expoſed to danger in this kind*; but the Canonical Scripture being by this means guarded with Univerſal care and diligence was not obnoxious to ſuch attempts. And this aſſurance of the Scriptures incorruption, is common to us with him; we therefore are as certain hereof as S. *Auſtin* was, and that I hope was certain enough. Yet if this does not ſatisfie you, I ſay farther, We are as certain hereof as your own *Pope Sixtus Quintus* was. He in his *Preface to his Bible* tells us, [b] That *in the preveſtigation of the true and genuine Text, it was perſpicuouſly manifeſt to all men, that there was no Argument more firm and certain to be relied upon, than the Faith of Ancient Books.* Now this ground we have to build upon as well as He had: and therefore our certainty is as great, and ſtands upon as certain ground as his did.

[a] *Neque enim ſic poſuit integritas atque notitia literarum quamlibet illuſtris Epiſcopi, cuſtodiri, quemadmodum ſcriptura Canonica tot linguarum literis & ordine & ſucceſſione celebrationis Eccleſiaſticæ cuſtoditur; contra quam non defuerunt tamen, qui ſub nominibus Apoſtolorum multa confingerent. Fruſtra quidem; Quia illa ſic commendata, ſic celebrata, ſic nota eſt. Verum quid poſſit adverſus literas non Canonica authoritate fundatas etiam hinc demonſtrabit impiæ conatus audaciæ, quod & adverſus eos quæ tanta notitiæ mole firmatæ ſunt, ſeſe erigere non prætermiſit.* Aug. ep. 48. *ad* Vincent. *contra* Donat & Rogat. [b] *In hac Germani textus perveſtigatione, ſatis perſpicue inter omnes conſtat, nullum argumentum eſſe certius ac firmius, quam antiquorum probatorum codicum latinorum fidem,* &c. *ſic* Sixtus in præfat.

56. This is not all I have to ſay in this matter. For I will add moreover, that we are as certain in what Language the Scripture is uncorrupted, as any man in your Church was, until *Clement* the 8th ſet forth your own approved *Edition of your Vulgar* Tranſlation. For you do not, nor cannot, without extreme impudence deny, that until then, there was great variety of Copies currant in divers parts of your Church, and thoſe very frequent in various lections: all which Copies might poſſibly be falſe in ſome things, but more than one ſort of them, could not poſſibly be true in all things. Neither were it leſs impudence

impudence to pretend, that any man in your Church, could until *Clements's* time have any certainty what that one true Copy and reading was (if there were any one perfectly true.) Some indeed that had got *Sixtus his Bible*, might after the Edition of that very likely think themſelves cock-ſure of a perfect true uncorrupted Tranſlation, without being beholden to *Clement*; but how fouly they were abuſed and deceived that thought ſo, the Edition of *Clemens*, differing from that of *Sixtus* in a great multitude of places, doth ſufficiently demonſtrate.

57. This certainty therefore in what Language the Scripture remains uncorrupted, is it neceſſary to have it, or is it not? If it be not, I hope we may do well enough without it. If it be neceſſary, what became of your Church for 1500 Years together? All which time you muſt confeſs ſhe had no ſuch certainty: no one man being able truly and upon good ground to ſay, *This or that Copy of the Bible is pure, and perfect, and uncorrupted in all things.* And now at this preſent, though ſome of you are grown to a higher degree of Preſumption in this point, yet are you as far as ever, from any true and real, and rational aſſurance of the abſolute purity of your Authentick Tranſlation: which I ſuppoſe my ſelf to have proved unanſwerably in divers places.

58. Ad 16. §.] *C. M.* Objects to *Proteſtants*, That *their Tranſlations of the Scripture are very different, and by each other mutually condemned.* Luthers *Tranſlation by* Zwinglius, *and others*: That *of the* Zwinglians *by* Luther. *The Tranſlation of* Oecolampadius, *by the Divines of* Baſil: *that of* Caſtalio *by* Beza: *That of* Beza *by* Caſtalio. *That of* Calvin, *by* Carolus Molinæus. *That of* Geneva *by* M. Parks, *and* King James. *And laſtly one of our Tranſlations by the* Puritans.

59. *CHIL.* All which might have been as juſtly objected againſt that great variety of Tranſlations extant in the Primitive Church, and made uſe of by the Fathers and Doctors of it. For which I deſire not that my word, but S. *Auſtins* may be taken. *They which have Tranſlated the Scriptures out of the* Hebrew *into* Greek, *may be num-*

bred, but the Latine *Interpreters are innumerable. For whenſoever any one, in the firſt times of Chriſtianity, met with a* Greek Bible, *and ſeemed to himſelf to have ſome ability in both Languages, he preſently ventured upon an Interpretation.* So *He*, in his *ſecond Book of Chriſtian Doctrine. Cap.* 11. Of all theſe, that which was called the *Italian Tranſlation* was eſteemed beſt; ſo we may learn from the ſame S. *Auſtin in the* 15. *Chap. of the ſame Book. Amongſt all theſe Interpretations* (ſaith he) *let the* Italian *be preferred: for it keeps cloſer to the Letter, and is perſpicuous in the ſenſe.* Yet ſo far was the Church of that time from perſuming upon the abſolute purity and perfection, even of this beſt Tranſlation, that S. *Hierome* thought it neceſſary to make a new Tranſlation of the *Old Teſtament*, out of the *Hebrew* Fountain, (which himſelf teſtifies in his Book *de Viris Illuſtribus,*) And to correct the vulgar verſion of the *New Teſtament*, according to the truth of the Original *Greek*; amending many Errors which had crept into it, whether by the miſtake of the Author, or the negligence of the Tranſcribers; which work he undertook and performed at the requeſt of *Damaſus*, Biſhop of *Rome. You conſtrain me* (ſaith he) *to make a new Work of an old: that after the Copies of the Scriptures have been diſperſed through the whole World, I ſhould ſit as it were an Arbitrator amongſt them, and becauſe they vary among themſelves, ſhould determine what are thoſe things* (*in them*) *which conſent with the* Greek *verity.* And after: *Therefore this preſent Preface promiſes the four Goſpels only corrected by collation with* Greek *Copies. But that they might not be very diſſonant from the Cuſtome of the* Latine *reading, I have ſo tempered with my ſtile, the Tranſlation of the Ancients, that, thoſe things amended wich did ſeem to change the ſenſe, other things I have ſuffered to remain as they were.* So that in this matter *Proteſtants* muſt either ſtand or fall with the Primitive Church.

62. C. M. *But the Faith of* Proteſtants *relies upon Scripture alone; Scripture is delivered to moſt of them by Tranſlations; Tranſlations depend upon the skill and honeſty of Men, who certainly may Err becauſe they are Men, and certainly*

do

do Err, at leaſt ſome of them, becauſe their Tranſlations are contrary. It ſeems then the Faith, and conſequently the Salvation of Proteſtants *relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds.*

63. *CHIL.* This Objection, though it may ſeem to do you great ſervice for the preſent; yet I fear you will repent the time that ever you urged it againſt us as a fault, that we make mens ſalvation *depend upon uncertainties.* For the Objection returns upon you many ways, as firſt thus; The Salvation of many Millions of *Papiſts* (as they ſuppoſe and teach) depends upon their having the Sacrament of Pennance truly adminiſtred unto them. This again upon the Miniſter's being a true Prieſt. That ſuch or ſuch a man is Prieſt, not himſelf, much leſs any other can have any poſſible certainty: for it depends upon a great many contingent and uncertain ſuppoſals. He that will pretend to be certain of it, muſt undertake to know for a certain all theſe things that follow.

64. Firſt that he was Baptized with due matter. Secondly, with the due form of Words, (which he cannot know, unleſs he were both preſent and attentive.) Thirdly, he muſt know that he was Baptized with due Intention, and that is, that the Miniſter of his Baptiſm was not a ſecret *Jew*, nor a *Moore*, nor an *Atheiſt*, (of all which kinds, I fear experience gives you juſt cauſe to fear, that *Italy* and *Spain* have Prieſts not a few,) but a Chriſtian in Heart, as well as Profeſſion; (otherwiſe believing the Sacrament to be nothing, in giving it he could intend to give nothing.) nor a *Samoſatenian*, nor an *Arrian*: but one that was capable of having due intention, from which they that believe not the Doctrine of the Trinity are excluded by you. And laſtly, that he was neither Drunk not Diſtracted at the adminiſtration of the Sacrament, nor out of negligence or malice omitted his intention.

65. Fourthly, he muſt undertake to know, that the Biſhop which ordained him Prieſt, ordained him compleatly with due Matter, Form and Intention: and conſequently, that he again was neither *Jew*, nor *Moore*, nor *Atheiſt*, nor liable to any ſuch exception, as is unconſiſtent with due Intention in giving the Sacrament of Orders. 66.

66. Fifthly, he muſt undertake to know, that the Biſhop which made him Prieſt, was a Prieſt himſelf, for your rule is, *Nihil dat quod non habet*: And conſequently, that there was again none of the former nullities in his Baptiſm, which might make him incapable of Ordination; nor no invalidity in his Ordination, but a true Prieſt to ordain him again, the requiſite matter and form and due intention all concurring.

67. Laſtly, he muſt pretend to know the ſame of him that made him Prieſt, and him that made Him Prieſt, even until he comes to the very Fountain of Prieſthood. For take any one in the whole train and ſucceſſion of Ordainers, and ſuppoſe him, by reaſon of any defect, only a ſuppoſed and not a true Prieſt, then according to your Doctrine he could not give a true, but only a ſuppoſed Prieſthood; and they that receive it of him, and again, they that derive it from them, can give no better than they received; receiving nothing but a name and ſhadow, can give nothing but a name and ſhadow: and ſo from Age to Age, from Generation to Generation being equivocal Fathers, beget only equivocal Sons; No Principle in Geometry being more certain than this, That *the unſuppliable defect of any neceſſary Antecedent, muſt needs cauſe a nullity of all thoſe Conſequences which depend upon it.* In fine, to know this one thing, you muſt firſt know Ten Thouſand others, whereof not any one is a thing that can be known; there being no neceſſity that it ſhould be true, which only can qualifie any thing for an Object of Science, but only, at the beſt, a high degree of probability that it is ſo. But then, that of Ten Thouſand probables no one ſhould be falſe; that of Ten Thouſand requiſites, whereof any one may fail, not one ſhould be wanting, this to me is extremely improbable, and even Couſin-german to Impoſſible. So that the aſſurance hereof is like a Machine compoſed of an innumerable multitude of pieces, of which it is ſtrangely unlikely but ſome will be out of order; and yet if any one be ſo, the whole Fabrick of neceſſity falls to the ground. And he that ſhall put together, and maturely conſider all the poſſible ways

ways of lapſing, and nullifying a Prieſthood in the Church of *Rome*, I believe will be very inclinable to think, that it is an hundred to one, that amongſt a hundred ſeeming Prieſts, there is not one true one. Nay, that it is not a thing very improbable, that amongſt thoſe many millions, which make up the *Romiſh Hierarchy*, there are *not twenty* true. But be the truth in this what it will be, once this is certain, that They which makes mens Salvation (as you do) depend upon Prieſtly Abſolution, and this again (as you do) upon the Truth and reality of the Prieſthood that gives it, and this laſtly upon a great multitude of apparent uncertainties, are not the fitteſt men in the World, to object to others as a horrible crime, *That they make mens Salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain Foundations.* And let this be the firſt retortion of your Argument.

68. But ſuppoſe this difficulty aſſoiled, and that an Angel from Heaven ſhould aſcertain you (for other aſſurances you can have none) that the Perſon, you make uſe of, is a true Prieſt, and a competent Miniſter of the Sacrament of Pennance; yet ſtill the doubt will remain, whether he will do you that good which he can do, whether he will pronounce the abſolving words with intent to abſolve you! For perhaps he may bear you ſome ſecret malice, and project to himſelf your damnation, for a compleat *Italian* revenge. Parhaps (as the tale is of a Prieſt that was lately burnt in *France*) he may upon ſome conditions have compacted with the Devil to give no Sacraments with Intention. Laſtly, he may be (for ought you can poſſibly know) a ſecret *Jew*, or *Moor*, or *Anti-Trinitarian*, or perhaps ſuch a one as is ſo far from intending your forgiveneſs of ſins and Salvation by this Sacrament, that in his heart he laughs at all theſe things, and thinks Sin nothing, and Salvation a word. All theſe doubts you muſt have clearly reſolved (which can hardly be done but by another Revelation,) before you can upon good grounds aſſure your ſelf, that your true Prieſt gives you true and effectual abſolution. So that when you have done as much as God requires for your Salvation, yet can you by no means be ſecure, but that you may have the

ill

ill luck to be Damned: which is to make Salvation a matter of chance, and not of choice, and which a man may fail of, not only by an ill life, but by ill Fortune. Verily a moſt comfortable Doctrine for a conſidering man lying upon Death bed, who either feels or fears that his repentance is but attrition only, and not contrition, and conſequently believes that if he be not abſolved really by a true Prieſt, he cannot poſſibly eſcape damnation. Such a man for his comfort, you tell, firſt (you that will have *mens Salvation depend upon no uncertainties,*) that though he verily believe that his ſorrow for ſins is a true ſorrow, and his purpoſe of amendment a true purpoſe; yet he may deceive himſelf, perhaps it is not, and if it be not, he muſt be damned. Yet you bid him hope well: But *Spes eſt rei incertæ nomen.* You tell him ſecondly, that though the party he confeſſes to, ſeem to be a true Prieſt, yet for ought he knows, or for ought himſelf knows, by reaſon of ſome ſecret undiſcernable invalidity in his Baptiſm or Ordination, he may be none: and if he be none, he can do nothing. This is a hard ſaying, but this is not the worſt. You tell him thirdly, that he may may be in ſuch a ſtate that he cannot, or if he can, that he will not give the Sacrament with due Intention: and if he does not, all's in vain. Put caſe a man by theſe conſiderations ſhould be caſt into ſome agonies; what advice, what comfort would you give him? Verily I know not what you could ſay to him, but this; that firſt for the Qualification required on his part, he might know that he deſired to have true ſorrow, and that that is ſufficient. But then if he ſhould ask you, why he might not know his ſorrow to be a true ſorrow, as well as his deſire to be ſorrowful, to be a true deſire, I believe you would be put to ſilence. Then ſecondly, to quiet his fears, concerning the Prieſt and his intention you ſhould tell him, by my advice, that Gods goodneſs (which will not ſuffer him to damn men for not doing better than their beſt,) will ſupply all ſuch defects as to humane endeavours were unavoidable. And therefore though his Prieſt were indeed no Prieſt, yet to him he ſhould be as if he were one: and if he gave Abſolution with-

without Intention, yet in doing ſo he ſhould hurt himſelf only and not his penitent. This were ſome comfort indeed, and this were to ſettle mens Salvation upon reaſonable certain grounds. But this I fear you will never ſay; for this were to reverſe many Doctrines eſtabliſhed by your Church, and beſides to degrade your Prieſthood from a great part of their honour, by leſſening the ſtrict neceſſity of the Laities dependance upon them. For it were to ſay, that *the Prieſts Intention is not neceſſary to the obtaining of abſolution*; which is to ſay, that it is not in the Parſons power to damn whom he will in his Pariſh, becauſe by this Rule, God ſhould ſupply the defect which his malice had cauſed. And beſides it were to ſay, that *Infants dying without Baptiſm might be ſaved*, God ſupplying the want of Baptiſm which to them is unavoidable. But beyond all this, it were to put into my mouth a full and ſatisfying anſwer to your Argument, which I am now returning, ſo that in anſwering my objection you ſhould anſwer your own. For then I ſhould tell you, that it were altogether as abhorrent from the goodneſs of God, and as repugnant to it, to ſuffer an ignorant Lay-mans Soul to periſh, meerly for being miſled by an undiſcernable falſe Tranſlation, which yet was commended to him by the Church, which (being of neceſſity to credit ſome in this matter) he had reaſon to rely upon either above all other, or as much as any other, as it is to damn a penitent ſinner for a ſecret defect in that deſired Abſolution, which his Goſtly Father perhaps was an *Atheiſt* and could not give him, or was a villiain and would not. This anſwer therefore, which alone would ſerve to comfort your penitent in his perplexities, and to aſſure him that he cannot fail of Salvation if he will not, for fear of inconveniencies you muſt forbear. And ſeeing you muſt, I hope you will come down from the Pulpit, and Preach no more againſt others for *making mens Salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain grounds*, leſt by judging others, you make your ſelves and your own Church inexcuſable, who are ſtrongly guilty of this fault, above all the men and Churches of the World: whereof I have already

given you two very pregnant demonſtrations, drawn from your preſumptions tying God and Salvation to your Sacraments; And the efficacy of them to your Prieſts Qualifications and Intentions.

69. Your making the Salvation of Infants depend on Baptiſm a Caſual thing, and in the power of man to confer, or not confer, would yield me a Third of the ſame nature. And your ſuſpending the ſame on the Baptizers intention a Fourth. And laſtly your making the Real preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt depend upon the caſualties of the Conſecrators true Prieſthood and Intention, and yet commanding men to believe it for certain that he is preſent, and to adore the Sacrament, which according to your Doctrine, for ought they can poſſibly know, may be nothing elſe but a piece of Bread, ſo expoſing them to the danger of Idolatry, and conſequently of Damnation, doth offer me a Fifth demonſtration of the ſame concluſion, if I thought fit to inſiſt upon them. But I have no mind to draw any more out of this Fountain; neither do I think it Charity to cloy the Reader with uniformity, when the Subject affords variety.

70. Sixthly, thererefore I return it thus. The Faith of *Papiſts* relies alone upon their Churches infallibility. That there is any Church infallible, and that theirs is it, they pretend not to believe, but only upon *prudential motives.* Dependance upon prudential motives they confeſs to be obnoxious to a poſſibility of erring. What then remaineth but Truth, Faith, Salvation, and all muſt in them rely upon a fallible and uncertain ground!

71. Seventhly, The Faith of *Papiſts* relies upon the Church alone. The Doctrine of the Church is delivered to moſt of them by their Pariſh Prieſt, or Ghoſtly Father, or at leaſt by a company of Prieſts, who for the moſt part ſure, are men and not Angels, in whom nothing is more certain than a moſt certain poſſibility to Err. What then remaineth but that Truth, Faith, Salvation and all, muſt in them rely upon a fallible and uncertain ground.

72. Eighthly

72. Eighthly thus. It is apparent and undeniable, that many Thouſands there are, who believe your Religion upon no better grounds, than a man may have for the belief almoſt of any Religion. As ſome believe it, becauſe their Forefathers did ſo, and they were good People. Some, becauſe they were Chriſtened, and brought up in it. Some, becauſe it is the Religion of their Country, where all other Religions are perſecuted and proſcribed. Some, becauſe *Proteſtants* cannot ſhew a perpetual ſucceſſion of Profeſſors of all their Doctrine. Some, becauſe the ſervice of your Church is more ſtately, and pompous, and magnificent. Some, becauſe they find comfort in it. Some, becauſe your Religion is farther ſpread, and hath more Profeſſors of it, than the Religion of *Proteſtants*. Some, becauſe *your* Prieſts *compaſs Sea and Land to gain Proſelytes to it.* Laſtly, an infinite number, by chance, and they know not why, but only becauſe they are ſure they are in the right. This which I ſay is a moſt certain experimented Truth, and if you will deal ingeniouſly, you will not deny it. And without queſtion he that builds his Faith upon our *Engliſh Tranſlation*, goes upon a more prudent ground than any of theſe can, with reaſon, be pretended to be. What then can you alledge but that, with you, rather than with us, Truth and Faith and Salvation and all relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds.

73. Ninthly. Your *Rhemiſh* and *Doway* Tranſlations are delivered to your Proſelytes, (ſuch I mean that are diſpenced with for the reading of them,) for the direction of their Faith and Lives. And the ſame may be ſaid of your Tranſlations of the Bible into other national Languages, in reſpect of thoſe that are Licenſed to read them. This I preſume you will confeſs. And moreover, that theſe Tranſlations came not by inſpiration, but were the productions of humane Induſtry; and that not Angels, but men were the Authors of them. Men I ſay, meer men, ſubject to the ſame Paſſions and to the ſame poſſibility of erring with our Tranſlators. And then how does it not unavoidably follow, that in them which depend upon theſe Tranſlations for their direction

rection, Faith, and Truth, and Salvation, and all relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds?

74. Tenthly and laſtly (to lay the Axe to the Root of the Tree,) the *Helena* which you ſo fight for, your vulgar Tranſlation, though ſome of you believe, or pretend to believe, it to be in every part and particle of it, the pure and uncorrupted Word of God; yet others among you, and thoſe as good and zealous Catholicks as you, are not ſo confident hereof.

75. Firſt, for all thoſe who have made Tranſlations of the whole Bible or any part of it different many times in ſenſe from the Vulgar, as *Lyranus, Cajetan, Pagnine, Arias, Eraſmus, Valla, Steuchus*, and others, it is apparent and even palpable, that they never dreamt of any abſolute perfection and authentical Infallibility of the *Vulgar Tranſlation*. For if they had, why did they in many places reject it and differ from it?

76. *Vega* was preſent at the Council of *Trent*, when that decree was made, which made the *Vulgar Edition* (then not extant any where in the World) *authentical*, and not to be rejected upon any pretence whatſoever. At the forming this decree *Vega* I ſay was preſent, underſtood the mind of the Council, as well as any man, and profeſſes that he was inſtructed in it by the *Preſident* of it, the *Cardinal* S. *Cruce*. And yet he hath written that *the Council in this decree, meant to pronounce this Tranſlation free* (not ſimply from all Error) *but only from ſuch Errors, out of which any opinion pernicious to Faith and Manners might be collected*. This, *Andradius* in his defence of that Council reports of *Vega*, and aſſents to it himſelf. *Driedo*, in his *Book of the Tranſlation of Holy Scripture*, hath theſe Words very pregnant and pertinent to the ſame purpoſe; *The See Apoſtolick, hath approved or accepted* Hieroms *Edition, not as ſo wholly conſonant to the Original, and ſo entire and pure and reſtored in all things, that it may not be lawful for any man, either by comparing it with the Fountain to examine it, or in ſome places to doubt, whether or no* Hierome *did underſtand the true ſenſe of the Scripture; but only as an Edition to be preferred before all others then extant, and*

and no where deviating from the Truth in the Rules of Faith and good Life. *Mariana*, even where he is a moſt earneſt Advocate for the Vulgar Edition, yet acknowleges the imperfection of it in theſe Words, *The faults of the Vulgar Edition are not approved by the Decree of the Council of* Trent, *a multitude whereof we did collect from the variety of Copies.* And again, *We maintain that the Hebrew and Greek, were by no means rejected by the* Trent *Fathers: And that the Latin Edition is indeed approved, yet not ſo, as if they did deny that ſome places might be Tranſlated more plainly, ſome more properly; whereof it were eaſie to produce innumerable examples.* And this he there profeſſes to have *learnt of* Laines *the then General of the Society:* who was a great part of that Council, preſent at all the Actions of it, and of very great authority in it. *Pro Edit. vulg. c. 21. p. 99.*

77. To this ſo great authority he adds a reaſon of his opinion, which with all indifferent men will be of a far greater authority. *If the Council* (ſaith he) *had purpoſed to approve an Edition in all reſpects, and to make it of equal authority and credit with the Fountains, certainly they ought with exact care firſt to have corrected the Errors of the Interpreter:* which certainly they did not.

78. Laſtly *Bellarmine* himſelf, though he will not acknowledge any imperfection in the Vulgar Edition, yet he acknowledges that the caſe may, and does oft-times ſo fall out, that *it is impoſſible to diſcern which is the true reading of the Vulgar Edition, but only by recourſe unto the Originals, and dependence upon them.* *Bell. de verbo Dei l. 2. c. 11. p. 120.*

79. From all which it may evidently be collected, that though ſome of you flatter your ſelves with a vain imagination of the certain abſolute purity and perfection of your Vulgar Edition; yet the matter is not ſo certain, and ſo reſolved, but that the beſt Learned men amongſt you are often at a ſtand, and very doubtful ſometimes whether your Vulgar Tranſlation be true, and ſometimes whether this or that be your Vulgar Tranſlation, and ſometimes undoubtedly reſolved that your Vulgar Tranſlation is no true Tranſlation, nor conſonant to the Original, as it was at firſt delivered. And what then can be

be alledged, but that out of your own grounds it may be inferred and inforced upon you, that not only in your Lay-men, but your Clergy-men and Scholars, Faith and Truth and Salvation and all depends upon fallible and uncertain grounds? And thus by Ten ſeveral retortions of this one Argument, I have endeavoured to ſhew you, how ill you have complied with your own advice, which was *to take heed of urging Arguments that might be returned upon you.* I ſhould now by a direct anſwer, ſhew that it preſſeth not us at all: but I have in paſſing done it already, in the end of the ſecond retortion of this Argument, and thither I refer the Reader.

80. Whereas therefore, you exhort them *that will have aſſurance of true Scriptures, to fly to your Church for it:* I deſire to know (if they ſhould follow your advice) how they ſhould be aſſured that your Church can give them any ſuch aſſurance; which hath been *confeſſedly* ſo negligent, as to ſuffer many *whole Books of Scripture* to be utterly loſt. Again, in thoſe that remain, confeſſedly ſo negligent, as to ſuffer *the Originals of theſe that remain to be corrupted.* And laſtly, ſo careleſs of preſerving the integrity of the Copies of her Tranſlation, as to ſuffer *infinite variety of Readings* to come in to them, without keeping *any one perfect Copy,* which might have been as the Standard, and *Polycletus* his Canon to correct the reſt by. So that which was the true reading, and which the falſe, it was utterly undiſcernable, but only by comparing them with the Originals, which alſo ſhe pretends *to be corrupted.*

84. Ad 17. §.] In this Diviſion you charge us *with great uncertainty, concerning the true meaning of Scripture.* Which hath been anſwered already, by ſaying, That if you ſpeak of plain places, (and in ſuch all things neceſſary are contained,) we are ſufficiently certain of the meaning of them, neither need they any Interpreter: If of obſcure and difficult places, we confeſs we are uncertain of the ſenſe of many of them. But then we ſay there is no neceſſity we ſhould be certain. For if Gods Will had been we ſhould have underſtood him more certainly, he would have ſpoken more plainly. And

we

we ſay beſides, that as we are uncertain, ſo are You too; which he that doubts of, let him read your Commentators upon the Bible, and obſerve their various and diſſonant Interpretations, and he ſhall in this point need no further ſatisfaction.

85. *Obj.* But ſeeing *there are contentions among us, we are taught by nature and Scripture, and experience* (ſo you tell us out of M. *Hooker*) *to ſeek for the ending of them, by ſubmiting unto ſome Judicical ſentence, whereunto neither part may refuſe to ſtand.*

Anſw. This is very true. Neither ſhould you need to perſuade us to ſeek ſuch a means of ending all our Controverſies, if we could tell where to find it. But this we know, that none is fit to pronounce, for all the World, a judicial definitive obliging Sentence in Controverſies of Religion, but only ſuch a Man, or ſuch a ſociety of Men, as is authorized thereto by God. And beſides we are able to demonſtrate, that it hath not been the pleaſure of God to give to any Man, or Society of Men any ſuch authority. And therefore though we wiſh heartily that all Controverſies were ended, as we do that all ſin were aboliſht, yet we have little hope of the one, or the other, till the World be ended. And in the mean while, think it beſt to content our ſelves with, and to perſuade others unto an *Unity of Charity and mutual Toleration*; ſeeing God hath authorized no man to force all men to *Unity of Opinion*. Neither do we think it fit to argue thus, To us it ſeems convenient there ſhould be one Judge of all Controverſies for the whole World, therefore God has appointed one: But more modeſt and more reaſonable to collect thus, God hath appointed no ſuch Judge of Controverſies, therefore, though it ſeems to us convenient there ſhould be one, yet it is not ſo: Or though it were convenient for us to have one, yet it hath pleaſed God (for Reaſons beſt known to himſelf) not to allow us this convenience.

87. Ad 18. §.] That the true Interpretation of the Scripture ought to be received from the Church, you need not prove, for it is very eaſily granted by them, who profeſs

profeſs themſelves very ready to receive all Truths, much more the true ſenſe of Scripture, not only from the Church, but from any Society of men, nay from any man whatſoever.

88. That the *Churches Interpretation of Scripture is always true*, that is it which you would have ſaid: and that in ſome ſenſe may be alſo admitted. *viz.* If you ſpeak of that Church (which before you ſpeak of in the 14. §.) that is, of the Church of all Ages ſince the Apoſtles. Upon the Tradition of which Church, you there told us, *We were to receive the Scripture, and to believe it to be the Word of God.* For there you teach us, that *our Faith of Scripture depends on a Principle which requires no other proof*, And that, *ſuch is Tradition, which from Hand to Hand, and Age to Age bring us up to the Times and Perſons of the Apoſtles and our Saviour himſelf, cometh to be confirmed by all thoſe Miracles, and other Arguments whereby they convinced their Doctrine to be true.* Wherefore the Ancient Fathers avouch that we muſt receive the Sacred Scripture upon the Tradition of this Church. The Tradition then of this Church you ſay muſt teach us what is Scripture: and we are willing to believe it. And now if you make it good unto us, that the ſame Tradition down from the Apoſtles, hath delivered from Age to Age, and from Hand to Hand, any Interpretation of any Scripture, we are ready to embrace that alſo. But now, if you will argue thus: The Church in one ſenſe, tells us what is Scripture, and we believe, therefore if the Church taken in another ſenſe, tell us, this or that is the meaning of the Scripture, we are to believe that alſo; this is too tranſparent Sophiſtry, to take any but thoſe that are willing to be taken.

89. If there be any Traditive Interpretation of Scripture, produce it, and prove it to be ſo; and we embrace it. But the Tradition of all Ages is one thing; and the authority of the preſent Church, much more of the *Roman Church*, which is but a Part, and a corrupted Part of the *Catholick Church*, is another. And therefore though we are ready to receive both Scripture and the

the ſenſe of Scripture upon the authority of *Original Tradition*, yet we receive neither the one, nor the other, upon the Authority of your Church.

90. Firſt for the Scripture, how can we receive them upon the Authority of your Church: who hold now thoſe Books to be Canonical, which formerly you rejected from the Canon? I inſtance, in the *Book of Macchabees*, and the *Epiſtle to the Hebrews*. The firſt of theſe you held not to be Canonical in S. *Gregories* time, or elſe he was no member of your Church, for it is apparent [a] He held otherwiſe. The ſecond you rejected from the Canon in S. *Hieroms* time, as it is evident out of [b] many places of his Works.

[a] See *Greg. Mor. l.* 19. *c.* 13.

[b] Thus he teſtifies. *Com. in Eſa. c.* 6. in theſe words. *Unde & Paulus Apoſt. in Epiſt. ad Heb. quam Latina conſuetudo non recipit*: and again in c. 8. in theſe, *In Ep. quæ ad Hebræos ſcribitur, licet eam Latina Conſuetudo inter Canonicas Scripturas non recipiat.*) &c.

91. If you ſay (which is all you can) that *Hierom ſpake this of the particular* Roman Church, *not of the* Roman Catholick *Church*; I anſwer, there was none ſuch in his time, None that was called ſo. Secondly, what he ſpake of the *Roman Church*, muſt be true of all other Churches, if your Doctrine of the neceſſity of the Conformity of all other Churches to that Church were then Catholick Doctrine. Now then chooſe whether you will, either that the particular *Roman Church*, was not then believed to be the Miſtris of all other Churches (notwithſtanding, *Ad hanc Eccleſiam neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam, hoc eſt, omnes qui ſunt undique fideles*,; which Card. *Perron*, and his *Tranſlatreſs* ſo often tranſlates falſe:) Or if you ſay ſhe was, you will run into a greater inconvenience, and be forced to ſay, that all the Churches of that time, rejected from the Canon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, together with the *Roman Church*. And conſequently that the *Catholick Church* may Err in rejecting from the Canon Scriptures truly Canonical.

92. Secondly, How can we receive the Scripture upon the authority of the *Roman Church*, which hath delivered at ſeveral times Scriptures in many places, different and repugnant, for Authentical and Canonical? which is moſt evident out of the place of *Malachy*, which is ſo quoted for the Sacrifice of the Maſs, that either all the Ancient Fathers had falſe Bibles, or yours is falſe.

Moſt evident likewiſe from the comparing of the ſtory of *Jacob* in *Geneſis*, with that which is cited out of it, in the *Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, according to the vulgar Edition. But above all, to any one, who ſhall compare the Bibles of *Sixtus* and *Clement*, ſo evident, that the wit of man cannot diſguiſe it.

93. Thus you ſee what reaſon we have to believe your Antecedent, *That your Church it is which muſt declare, what Books be true Scripture.* Now for the conſequence, that certainly is as liable to exception as the Antecedent. For if it were true, that God had promiſed to aſſiſt you, for the delivering of true Scripture, would this oblige him, or would it follow from hence that He had obliged himſelf, to teach you, not only ſufficiently, but *effectually* and *irriſiſtably* the true ſenſe of Scripture? God is not defective in things neceſſary: neither will he leave himſelf without witneſs, nor the World without means of knowing his will and doing it. And therefore it was neceſſary that by his Providence he ſhould preſerve the Scripture from any undiſcernable corruption, in thoſe things which he would have known: otherwiſe it is apparent, it had not been his will, that theſe things ſhould be known, the only means of continuing the knowledg of them being periſhed. But now neither is God laviſh in ſuperfluities, and therefore having given us means ſufficient for our direction, and power ſufficient to make uſe of theſe means, he will not conſtrain or neceſſitate us to make uſe of theſe means. For that were to croſs the end of our Creation, which was to be glorified by our free obedience: whereas neceſſity and freedom cannot ſtand together. That were to reverſe the Law which he hath preſcribed to himſelf in his dealing with men, and that is, *to ſet Life and Death before him, and to leave him in the hands of his own Counſel.* God gave the Wiſemen a Star to lead them to *Chriſt*, but he did not neceſſitate them to follow the guidance of this Star: that was left to their liberty. God gave the Children of *Iſrael a Fire to lead them by Night, and a Pillar of Cloud by Day*, but he conſtrained no man to follow them; that was left to

their

their liberty. So he gives the Church, the Scripture: which in thoſe things which are to be believed or done, are plain and eaſie to be followed, like the Wiſemens Star. Now that which he deſires of us on our part, is the Obedience of Faith, and love of the Truth, and deſire to find the true ſenſe of it, and induſtry in ſearching it, and humility in following, and Conſtancy in profeſſing it: all which if he ſhould work in us by an abſolute irreſiſtible neceſſity, he could no more require of us, as our duty, than he can of the Sun to ſhine, of the Sea to Ebb and Flow, and of all other Creatures to do thoſe things which by meer neceſſity they muſt do, and cannot chooſe. Beſides, what an impudence is it to pretend that *your Church is infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of the Scripture*, whereas there are Thouſands of places of Scripture, which you do not pretend certainly to underſtand, and about the Interpretation whereof, your own Doctors differ among themſelves? If your Church be infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of Scripture, why do not your Doctors follow her infallible direction? And if they do, how comes ſuch difference among them in their Interpretations?

94. Again, why does your Church thus put her Candle under a Buſhel, and keep her Talent of interpreting Scripture infallibly, thus long wrapt up in Napkins? Why ſets ſhe not forth Infallible Commentaries or Expoſitions upon all the Bible? Is it becauſe this would not be profitable for Chriſtians, that Scripture ſhould be Interpreted? Is it blaſphemous to ſay ſo. The Scripture it ſelf tells us, *All Scripture is profitable.* And the Scripture is not ſo much the Words as the Senſe. And if it be not profitable, why does ſhe imploy particular Doctors to interpret Scriptures fallibly? unleſs we muſt think that fallible Interpretations of Scripture are profitable, and infallible Interpretations would not be ſo?

95. If you ſay *the Holy Ghoſt, which aſſiſts the Church in interpreting, will move the Church to interpret when he ſhall think fit, and that the Church will do it when the Holy Ghoſt ſhall move her to do it:* I demand whether the Ho-

ly Ghoſts moving of the Church to ſuch works as theſe be reſiſtible by the Church, or irreſiſtible. If reſiſtible, then the Holy Ghoſt may move, and the Church may not be moved. As certainly the Holy Ghoſt doth always move to an Action, when he ſhews us plainly that it would be for the good of men, and Honour of God. As he that hath any ſenſe will acknowledge that an infallible expoſition of Scripture could not but be, and there is no conceivable reaſon, why ſuch a work ſhould be put off a day, but only becauſe you are conſcious to your ſelves, you cannot do it, and therefore make excuſes. But if the moving of the Holy Ghoſt be irreſiſtible, and you are not yet ſo moved to go about this work; then I confeſs you are excuſed. But then I would know, whether thoſe *Popes* which ſo long deferred the calling of a Council for the Reformation of your Church, at length pretended to be effected by the Council of *Trent*, whether they may excuſe themſelves, for that they were not moved by the Holy Ghoſt to do it? I would know likewiſe, as this motion is irreſiſtible when it comes, ſo whether it be ſo ſimply neceſſary to the moving of your Church to any ſuch publick Action, that it cannot poſſibly move without it? That is, whether the *Pope* now could not, if he would, ſeat himſelf *in Cathedra*, and fall to writing expoſitions upon the Bible for the directions of Chriſtians to the true ſenſe of it? If you ſay he cannot, you will make your ſelf ridiculous. If he can, then I would know, whether he ſhould be infallibly directed in theſe expoſitions, or no? If he ſhould, then what need he to ſtay for irreſiſtible motion? Why does he not go about this noble work preſently? If he ſhould not, How ſhall we know that the calling of the Council of *Trent* was not upon his own voluntary motion, or upon humane importunity and ſuggeſtion, and not upon the motion of the Holy Ghoſt? And conſequently how ſhall we know whether he were aſſiſtant to it or no, ſeeing he aſſiſts none but what he himſelf moves to? And whether he did move the *Pope* to call this Council, is a ſecret thing, which we cannot poſſibly know, nor perhaps the *Pope* himſelf.

96. If

96. If you ſay, your meaning is only, *That the Church ſhall be infallibly guarded from giving any falſe ſenſe of any Scripture, and not infalliblyaſſiſted poſitively to give the true ſenſe of all Scripture:* I put to you your own Queſtion, why ſhould we believe the Holy Ghoſt will ſtay there? Or, why may we not as well think he will ſtay at the firſt thing, that is, in teaching the Church what Books be true Scripture? For if the Holy Ghoſts aſſiſtance be promiſed to all things profitable, then will he be with them infallibly, not only to guard them from all Errors, but to guide them to all profitable truths, ſuch as the true ſenſes of all Scripture would be. Neither could he ſtay there, but defend them irreſiſtibly from all Vices; Nor there neither, but infuſe into them irreſiſtibly all Vertues: for all theſe things would be much for the benefit of Chriſtians. If you ſay, he cannot do this without taking away their free-will in living; I ſay neither can he neceſſitate men to believe aright, without taking away their free-will in believing and in profeſſing their belief.

97. *Obj.* To the place of S. *Auſtin,* (*I would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Church did move me.* Contr. ep. Fund. c. 5.)

Anſw. I anſwer, That not the Authority of the preſent Church, much leſs of a Part of it (as the *Roman Church* is) was that which alone moved Saint *Auſtin* to believe the Goſpel, but the perpetual Tradition of the Church of all Ages. Which you your ſelf have taught us to be the *only Principle by which the Scripture is proved, and which it ſelf needs no proof*; and to which you have referred this very ſaying of S. *Auſtin, Ego vero Evangelio non crederem niſi, &c.p.* 55. And in the next place which you cite out of his Book *De Util. Cred. c.* 14. he ſhews, that his *motives to believe, were, Fame, Celebrity, Conſent, Antiquity.* And ſeeing this Tradition, this Conſent, this Antiquity did as fully and powerfully move him not to believe *Manichæus,* as to believe the Goſpel, (the Chriſtian Tradition being as full againſt *Manichæus* as it was for the Goſpel) therefore he did well to conclude upon theſe grounds,

grounds, that he had as much reaſon to disbelieve *Manichæus*, as to believe the Goſpel. Now if you can truly ſay, that the ſame Fame, Celebrity, Conſent, Antiquity, that the ſame Univerſal and Original Tradition, lies againſt *Luther* and *Calvin*, as did againſt *Manichæus*, you may do well to apply the Argument againſt them; otherwiſe it will be to little purpoſe to ſubſtitute their names inſtead of *Manichæus*, unleſs you can ſhew the things agrees to them as well as him.

98. If you ſay, that S. *Auſtin ſpeaks here of the Authority of the Preſent Church, abſtracting from conſent with the Ancient*, and therefore you, ſeeing you have the preſent Church on your ſide againſt *Luther* and *Calvin*, as S. *Auſtin* againſt *Manichæus*, may urge the ſame words againſt them which S. *Auſtin* did againſt him;

99. I anſwer, Firſt that it is a vain preſumption of yours that the *Catholick Church is of your ſide*. Secondly, that if S. *Auſtin* ſpeak here of that preſent Church, which moved him to believe the Goſpel, without conſideration of the Antiquity of it, and its both Perſonal and Doctrinal ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles; His Argument will be like a *Buskin* that will ſerve any leg. It will ſerve to keep an *Arrian*, or a *Grecian* from being a *Roman Catholick*, as well as a Catholick from being an *Arrian*, or a *Grecian*? In as much as the *Arrians* and *Grecians*, did pretend to the Title of Catholicks, and the Church, as much as the *Papiſts* now do. If then you ſhould have come to an Ancient *Goth* or *Vandal*, whom the *Arrians* converted to Chriſtianity, and ſhould have moved him to your Religion; might he not ſay the very ſame words to you as S. *Auſtin* to the *Manichæans*? *I would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Church did move me. Them therefore whom I obeyed, ſaying believe the Goſpel, why ſhould I not obey ſaying to me, do not believe the* Homoouſians? *Chooſe what thou pleaſeſt: If thou ſhalt ſay believe the* Arrians, *they warn me not to give any Credit to you. If therefore I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou ſay do not believe the* Arrians, *thou ſhalt not do well to force me to the Faith of the* Homoouſians, *becauſe by the Preaching of the* Arrians

I believed the Goſpel it ſelf. If you ſay, you did well to believe them, commending the Goſpel, but you did not well to believe them diſcommending the Homoouſians: *Doeſt thou think me ſo very fooliſh, that without any reaſon at all, I ſhould believe what thou wilt, and not believe what thou wilt not?* It were eaſie to put theſe words into the mouth of a *Grecian, Abyſſine, Georgian,* or any other of any Religion. And I pray bethink your ſelves, what you would ſay to ſuch a one in ſuch a caſe, and imagine that we ſay the very ſame to you.

101. And whereas you ſay, S. *Auſtin may ſeem to have ſpoken Prophetically againſt* Proteſtants, *when he ſaid, Why ſhould I not moſt diligently inquire, what Chriſt commanded, of them before all others, by whoſe Authority I was moved to believe, that Chriſt Commanded any good thing?*

Anſw. I anſwer, Until you can ſhew that *Proteſtants* believe that Chriſt commanded any good thing, that is, That they believe the truth of Chriſtian Religion upon the Authority of the Church of *Rome*, this place muſt be wholly impertinent to your purpoſe; which is to make *Proteſtants* believe your Church to be the infallible expounder of Scriptures and judge of Controverſies: nay rather is it not directly againſt your purpoſe? For why may not a member of the Church of *England,* who received his Baptiſm, Education and Faith from the Miniſtry of this Church, ſay juſt ſo to you as S. *Auſtin* here to the *Manichees*? Why ſhould I not moſt diligently inquire, what Chriſt commanded, of them (the Church of *England*) before all others, by whoſe authority I was moved to believe, that Chriſt commanded any good thing, Can you, *F.* or *K.* or whoſoever you are, better declare to me what he ſaid, whom I would not have thought to have been or to be, if the belief thereof had been recommended by you to me? This therefore (that *Chriſt Jeſus* did thoſe miracles, and taught that Doctrine which is contained evidently in the undoubted Books of the *New Teſtament*) I believed by Fame, ſtrengthened with Celebrity and Conſent, (even of thoſe which in other things are at infinite variance one with another,) and laſtly by Antiquity (which gives an Univerſal and a conſtant atteſtation to them) But

every

every one may ſee that you, ſo few (in compariſon of all thoſe upon whoſe conſent we ground our belief of Scripture,) ſo turbulent, (that you damn all to the Fire, and to Hell, that any way differ from you; that you profeſs it is lawful for you, to uſe violence and power whenſoever you can have it, for the planting of your own Doctrine, and the extirpation of the contrary;) laſtly ſo new in many of your Doctrines, (as in the lawfulneſs, and expedience of debarring the Laity the Sacramental Cup; the lawfulneſs and expedience of your Latine Service, Tranſubſtantiation, Indulgences, Purgatory, the *Popes* infallibility, his Authority over Kings, *&c*) ſo new I ſay, in compariſon of the undoubted Books of Scripture, which evidently containeth, or rather is our Religion, and the ſole, and adequate object of our Faith: I ſay every one may ſee that you, ſo few, ſo turbulent, ſo new, can produce nothing deſerving authority (with wiſe and conſiderate men) What madneſs is this? Believe them the conſent of Chriſtians which are now, and have been ever ſince Chriſt in the World, that we ought to believe Chriſt; but learn of us what Chriſt ſaid, which contradict and damn all other parts of Chriſtendom. Why I beſeech you? Surely if they were not at all, and could not teach me any thing, I would more eaſily perſuade my ſelf, that I were not to believe in Chriſt, than that I ſhould learn any thing concerning him, from any other, than them by whom I believed him: at leaſt, than that I ſhould learn what his Religion was from you, who have wronged ſo exceedingly his Miracles and his Doctrine, by forging ſo evidently ſo many falſe Miracles for the Confirmation of your new Doctrine; which might give us juſt occaſion, had we no other aſſurance of them but your Authority, to ſuſpect the true ones. Who with forging ſo many falſe Stories, and falſe Authors, have taken a fair way to make the Faith of all Stories queſtionable; if we had no other ground for our belief of them but your Authority: who have brought in Doctrines plainly and directly contrary to that which you confeſs to be the Word of Chriſt, and which, for the moſt part, make either for the honour

or

or profit of the Teachers of them: which (if there were no difference between the Chriſtian and the *Roman* Church) would be very apt to make ſuſpicious men believe that Chriſtian Religion was a humane invention, taught by ſome cunning Impoſtors, only to make themſelves rich and powerful; who make a profeſſion of corrupting all ſorts of Authors: a ready courſe to make it juſtly queſtionable whether any remain uncorrupted. For if you take this Authority upon you, upon the ſix Ages laſt paſt; how ſhall we know, that the Church of that time, did not Uſurp the ſame Authority upon the Authors of the ſix laſt Ages before them, and ſo upwards until we come to Chriſt himſelf? Whoſe queſtioned Doctrines, none of them came from the Fountain of Apoſtolick Tradition, but have inſinuated themſelves into the Streams, by little and little, ſome in one Age, and ſome in another, ſome more Anciently, ſome more lately, and ſome yet are Embrio's, yet hatching, and in the Shell; as the *Popes* Infallibility, the Bleſſed Virgins immaculate conception, the *Popes* power over the Temporalities of Kings, the Doctrine of Predetermination, *&c.* all which yet are, or in time may be impoſed upon Chriſtians under the Title of *Original and Apoſtolick Tradition*; and that with that neceſſity, that they are told, they were as good believe nothing at all, as not believe theſe things to have come from the Apoſtles, which they know to have been brought in but yeſterday: which whether it be not a ready and likely way to make men conclude thus with themſelves— I am told, that I were as good believe nothing at all, as believe ſome points which the Church teaches me, and not others: and ſome things which ſhe teaches to be Ancient and Certain, I plainly ſee to be New and Falſe, therefore I will believe nothing at all. Whether I ſay the foreſaid grounds be not a ready and likely way to make men conclude thus, and whether this concluſion be not too often made in *Italy*, and *Spain*, and *France*, and in *England* too, I leave it to the judgment of thoſe that have Wiſdom and Experience. Seeing therefore the *Roman Church* is ſo far from being a ſufficient

ent Foundation for our belief in Chriſt, that it is in ſundry regards a dangerous temptation againſt it; why ſhould I not much rather conclude, Seeing we receive not the knowledg of Chriſt and Scriptures from the Church of *Rome*, neither from her muſt we take his Doctrine, or the Interpretation of Scripture?

102. Ad §. 19. In this number, this Argument is contained. *The Judge of Controverſies ought to be intelligible to learned and unlearned; The Scripture is not ſo, and the Church is ſo; Therefore the Church is the Judge, and not the Scripture.*

103. To this I anſwer: As to be underſtandible is a condition requiſite to a Judge, ſo is not that alone ſufficient to make a Judge; otherwiſe you might make your ſelf Judge of Controverſies, by arguing; The Scripture is not intelligible by all, but I am, therefore I am Judge of Controverſies. If you ſay your intent was to conclude againſt the Scripture, and not for the Church: I demand why then, but to delude the ſimple with Sopiſtry, did you ſay in the cloſe of this §. *Such is the Church, and the Scripture is not ſuch?* but that you would leave it to them to infer in the end, (which indeed was more than you undertook in the beginning) *Therefore the Church is Judge and the Scripture not.* I ſay Secondly; that you ſtill run upon a falſe ſuppoſition: that God hath appointed ſome Judge of all Controverſies that may happen among Chriſtians, about the ſenſe of obſcure Texts of Scripture: whereas he has left every one to his liberty herein, in thoſe words of S. *Paul*, *Quiſque abundet in ſenſu ſuo*, &c. I ſay Thirdly. Whereas ſome *Proteſtants* make the Scripture Judge of Controverſies, that they have the Authority of Fathers to warrant their manner of ſpeaking: as of * *Optatus.*

* *Contra Parmen. l. 5. in Prin.*

104. But ſpeaking truly and properly the Scripture is not a Judge nor cannot be, but only, a *ſufficient Rule*, for thoſe to judge by, that believe it to be the word of God (as the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome* both do,) what they are to believe, and what they are not to believe. I ſay ſufficiently perfect, and ſufficiently intelligible in things neceſſary, to all that have underſtanding, whether

whether they be learned or unlearned. And my reaſon hereof is convincing and demonſtrative; becauſe nothing is neceſſary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed. For to ſay, that when a place of Scripture, by reaſon of ambiguous terms, lies indifferent between divers ſenſes, whereof one is true, and the other is falſe, that God obliges men under pain of damnation, not to miſtake through error and humane frailty, is to make God a Tyrant, and to ſay that he requires us certainly to attain that end, for the attaining whereof we have no certain means; which is to ſay, that, like *Pharaoh*, he gives no ſtraw, and requires brick; that he reaps where he ſows not; that he gathers where he ſtrews not, that he will not be pleaſed with our utmoſt endeavors to pleaſe him, without full and exact and never failing performance; that his will is we ſhould do what he knows we cannot do; that he will not accept of us according to that which we have, but requireth of us what we have not. Which whether it can conſiſt with his goodneſs, with his wiſdom, and with his word, I leave it to honeſt men to judge. If I ſhould ſend a Servant to *Paris*, or *Rome*, or *Jeruſalem*, and he uſing his utmoſt diligence not to miſtake his way, yet notwithſtanding, meeting often with ſuch places where the road is divided into ſeveral ways, whereof every one is as likely to be true, and as likely to be falſe as any other, ſhould at length miſtake and go out of the way; would not any man ſay that I were an impotent, fooliſh and unjuſt Maſter, if I ſhould be offended with him for doing ſo? And ſhall we not tremble to impute that to God, which we would take in foul ſcorn, if it were imputed to our ſelves? Certainly, I for my part fear I ſhould not love God if I ſhould think ſo ſtrangely of him.

105. Again, When you ſay, *that unlearned, and ignorant men cannot underſtand Scripture*, I would deſire you to come out of the Clouds, and tell us what you mean: Whether, that they cannot underſtand all Scripture, or that they cannot underſtand any Scripture, or that they cannot underſtand ſo much as is ſufficient for their direction to Heaven. If the firſt; I believe the Learned are in the

ſame Caſe. If the Second; every mans experience will confute you: for who is there that is not capable of a ſufficient underſtanding of the Story, the Precepts, the Promiſes, and the Threats of the Goſpel? If the Third; that they may underſtand ſomething, but not enough for their Salvations; I ask you, firſt. Why then doth Saint *Paul* ſay to *Timothy, The Scriptures are able to make him wiſe unto Salvation?* Why does Saint *Auſtin* ſay, *Ea quæ manifeſtè poſita ſunt in ſacris Scripturis, omnia continent quæ pertinent ad Fidem Moreſque vivendi?* Why does every one of the four *Evangeliſts* Intitle their Book *The Goſpel,* if any neceſſary and eſſential part of the Goſpel were left out of it? Can we imagine, that either they omitted ſomething neceſſary, out of ignorance not knowing it to be neceſſary? Or knowing it to be ſo, maliciouſly concealed it? Or out of negligence, did the work they had undertaken by halfes? If none of theſe things can without Blaſphemy be imputed to them, conſidering they were aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt in this work, then certainly it moſt evidently follows, that every one of them writ the whole Goſpel of Chriſt; I mean all the eſſential and neceſſary parts of it. So that if we had no other Book of Scripture, but one of them alone, we ſhould not want any thing neceſſary to Salvation. And what one of them has more than another, it is only profitable, and not neceſſary. Neceſſary indeed to be believed, becauſe revealed; but not therefore revealed, becauſe neceſſary to be believed.

106. Neither did they write only for the Learned, but for all men. This being one eſpecial means of the Preaching of the Goſpel, which was commanded to be Preached, not only to Learned men but *to all men.* And therefore, unleſs we will imagine the Holy Ghoſt and them to have been wilfully wanting to their own deſire and purpoſe, we muſt conceive, that they intended to ſpeak plain, even to the capacity of the ſimpleſt; at leaſt touching all things neceſſary to be publiſhed by them, and believed by us.

107. And

107. And whereas you pretend it *is ſo eaſie, and obvious both for the Learned and the ignorant, both to know which is the Church, and what are the Decrees of the Church, and what is the ſenſe of thoſe Decrees*: I ſay, this is a vain pretence.

108. For Firſt; How ſhall an unlearned man whom you have ſuppoſed now ignorant of Scripture, how ſhall he know which of all the Societies of Chriſtians is indeed the Church? You will ſay perhaps, *he muſt examine them by the notes of the Church, which are perpetual Viſibility, Succeſſion, Conformity with the ancient Church*, &c. But how ſhall he know, firſt, that theſe are the notes of the Church, unleſs by Scripture, which you ſay he underſtands not? You may ſay perhaps, he may be told ſo. But ſeeing men may deceive, and be deceived, and their words are no demonſtrations, how ſhall he be aſſured that what they ſay is true? So that at the firſt he meets with an impregnable difficulty, and cannot know the Church but by ſuch notes, which whether they be the notes of the Church he cannot poſſibly know. But let us ſuppoſe this *Iſthmus* digged through, and that he is aſſured theſe are the notes of the true Church: How can he poſſibly be a competent Judge, which Society of Chriſtians hath Title to theſe notes, and which hath not? Seeing this Trial of neceſſity requires a great ſufficiency of knowledge of the monuments of Chriſtian Antiquity, which no unlearned can have, becauſe he that hath it cannot be unlearned. As for example, how ſhall he poſſibly be able to know whether the Church of *Rome* hath had a perpetual Succeſſion of Viſible Profeſſors, which held always the ſame Doctrine which they now hold, without holding any thing to the contrary; unleſs he hath firſt examined, what was the Doctrine of the Church in the firſt Age, what in the ſecond, and ſo forth? And whether this be not a more difficult work, than to ſtay at the firſt Age, and to examine the Church by the conformity of her Doctrine, with the Doctrine of the firſt Age, every man of ordinary underſtanding may Judge.

Let

Let us imagine him advanced a ſtep farther, and to know which is the Church: how ſhall he know what that Church hath Decreed, ſeeing the Church hath not been ſo careful in keeping of her Decrees, but that many are loſt, and many corrupted? Beſides, when even the Learned among you are not agreed concerning divers things, whether they be *De Fide* or not; how ſhall the unlearned do? Then for the ſenſe of the Decrees, how can he be more capable of the underſtanding of them, then of plain Texts of Scripture, which you will not ſuffer him to underſtand? Eſpecially, ſeeing the Decrees of divers *Popes* and Councils are conceived ſo obſcurely, that the Learned cannot agree about the ſenſe of them. And then they are written all in ſuch Languages which the ignorant underſtand not, and therefore muſt of neceſſity rely herein upon the uncertain and fallible authority of ſome particular men, who inform them that there is ſuch a Decree. And if the Decrees were Tranſlated into Vulgar Languages, why the Tranſlators ſhould not be as fallible as you ſay the Tranſlators of Scripture are, who can poſſibly imagine?

109. Laſtly, how ſhall an unlearned man, or indeed any man, be aſſured of the certainty of that Decree, the certainty whereof depends upon ſuppoſitions which are impoſſible to be known whether they be true or no? For it is not the Decree of a Council, unleſs it be confirmed by a true *Pope*. Now the *Pope* cannot be a true *Pope* if he came in by Simony: which whether he did or no, who can anſwer me? He cannot be a true *Pope* unleſs he were Baptized, and Baptized he was not, unleſs the Miniſter had due Intention. So likewiſe he cannot be a true *Pope*, unleſs he were rightly ordained Prieſt, and that again depends upon the Ordainers ſecret Intention, and alſo upon his having the Epiſcopal Character. All which things, as I have formerly proved, depend upon ſo many uncertain ſuppoſitions, that no humane judgment can poſſibly be reſolved in them. I conclude therefore, that not the learnedſt man amongſt you all, no not the *Pope* himſelf, can, according to the grounds you go upon, have any certainty,

certainty, that any Decree of any Council is good and valid, and conſequently, not any aſſurance that it is indeed the Decree of a Council.

110. Ad §. 20.] C. M. *By referring Controverſies to Scripture alone, all is finally reduced to the internal private Spirit.*

CHIL. If by a *private Spirit*, you mean, a particular perſuaſion that a Doctrine is true, which ſome men pretend, but cannot prove to come from the Spirit of God: I ſay, to refer Controverſies to the Scripture, is not to refer them to this kind of private Spirit. For is there not a manifeſt difference between ſaying, *the Spirit of God tells me that this is the meaning of ſuch a Text* (which no man can poſſibly know to be true, it being a ſecret thing) and between ſaying, *theſe and theſe Reaſons I have to ſhew, that this or that is true Doctrine, or that this or that is the meaning of ſuch a Scripture?* Reaſon being a publick and certain thing and expoſed to all mens Trial and Examination. But now if by *private Spirit* you underſtand every Mans particular Reaſon, then your firſt and ſecond inconvenience will preſently be reduced to one, and ſhortly to none at all.

111. Ad §. 21.] C. M. *By taking the Office of Judicature from the Church, it is Conferred upon every particular Man.*

CHIL. And does not alſo giving the Office of Judicature to the Church, come to confer it upon every particular Man? For before any man believes the Church Infallible, muſt he not have reaſon to induce him to believe it to be ſo? and muſt he not judge of thoſe reaſons, whether they be indeed good and firm, or Captious and Sophiſtical? Or would you have all men believe all your Doctrine upon the Churches Infallibility, and the Churches Infallibility they know not why?

112. Secondly, ſuppoſing they are to be guided by the Church, they muſt uſe their own particular reaſon to find out which is the Church. And to that purpoſe you your ſelves give a great many Notes, which you pretend firſt to be Certain Notes of the Church, and then to be peculiar to your Church, and agreeable to none elſe;

but

but you do not ſo much as pretend, that either of thoſe pretences is evident of it ſelf, and therefore you go about to prove them both by reaſons; and thoſe reaſons I hope every particular man is to judge of, whether they do indeed conclude and convince that which they are alledged for: that is, that theſe marks are indeed certain Notes of the Church, and then that your Church hath them, and no other.

113. One of theſe Notes, indeed the only Note of a true and uncorrupted Church, is conformity with Antiquity; I mean the moſt Ancient Church of all, that is the Primitive and Apoſtolick. Now how is it poſſible any man ſhould examine your Church by this Note, but he muſt by his own particular judgment, find out what was the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, and what is the Doctrine of the preſent Church, and be able to anſwer all theſe Arguments which are brought to prove repugnance between them? otherwiſe he ſhall but pretend to make uſe of this Note for the finding the true Church, but indeed make no uſe of it, but receive the Church at a venture, as the moſt of you do; not one in a Hundred being able to give any tolerable reaſon for it. So that inſtead of reducing Men to particular reaſon, you reduce them to none at all, but to chance and paſſion, and prejudice and ſuch other ways, which if they lead one to the Truth, they lead Hundreds, nay Thouſands to Falſhood. But it is a pretty thing to conſider, how theſe men can blow Hot and Cold out of the ſame mouth to ſerve ſeveral purpoſes. Is there hope of gaining a Proſelyte? Then they will tell you, God hath given every every man Reaſon to follow; and if the Blind lead the Blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch. That it is no good reaſon for a mans Religion, that he was Born and brought up in it: For then a *Turk* ſhould have as much reaſon to be a *Turk*, as a Chriſtian to be a Chriſtian. That every man hath a judgment of Diſcretion; which if they will make uſe of, they ſhall eaſily find: that the true Church hath always ſuch and ſuch marks, and that their Church has them, and no other but theirs. But

then

then if any of theirs be perſuaded to a ſincere and ſufficient Trial of their Church, even by their own Notes of it, and to try whether they be indeed ſo conformable to Antiquity as they pretend, then their Note is changed: you muſt not uſe your own reaſon nor your judgment, but refer all to the Church, and believe her to be conformable to Antiquity, though they have no reaſon for it, nay though they have evident reaſon to the contrary. For my part I am certain that God hath given us our Reaſon to diſcern between Truth and Falſhood, and he that makes not this uſe of it, but believes things he knows not why, I ſay it is by chance that he believes the Truth, and not by choice: and that I cannot but fear, that God will not accept of this *Sacrifice of Fools.*

114. But you that would not have men follow their Reaſon, what would you have them to follow? their Paſſion? Or pluck out their eyes and go blindfold? *No*, you ſay *you would have them follow Authority.* On Gods name let them; we alſo would have them follow Authority; for it is upon the Authority of Univerſal Tradition, that we would have them believe Scripture. But then as for the Authority which you would have them follow, you will let them ſee reaſon why they ſhould follow it. And is not this to go a little about? to leave reaſon for a ſhort turn, and then to come to it again, and to do that which you condemn in others? It being indeed a plain impoſſibility for any man to ſubmit his reaſon but to reaſon: for he that does it to Authority, muſt of neceſſity think himſelf to have greater reaſon to believe that Authority. Therefore the confeſſion cited by *Brerely*, you need not think to have been extorted from *Luther* and the reſt. It came very freely from them, and what they ſay, you practiſe as much as they.

115. And whereas you ſay that a *Proteſtant admits of Fathers, Councils, Church, as far as they agree with Scripture, which upon the matter is himſelf:* I ſay you admit neither of them, nor the Scripture it ſelf, but only ſo far as it agrees with your Church: and your Church you admit becauſe you think you have reaſon to do ſo:

ſo that by you as well as by *Proteſtants* all is finally reſolved into your own reaſon.

116. Nor do *Hereticks* only but *Romiſh Catholicks* alſo ſet up as many Judges, as there are Men and Women in the Chriſtian World. For do not your Men and Women Judge your Religion to be true, before they believe it, as well as the Men and Women of other Religions? Oh but you ſay, *They receive it not becauſe they think it agreeable to Scripture, but becauſe the Church tells them ſo.* But then I hope they believe the Church becauſe their own reaſon tells them they are to do ſo. So that the difference between a *Papiſt* and a *Proteſtant* is this, not that the one judges and the other does not judge, but that the one judges his guide to be infallible, the other his way to be manifeſt. *This ſame pernitious Doctrine is taught by* Brentius, Zanchius, Cartwright, *and others.* It is ſo in very deed: But it is taught alſo by ſome others, whom you little think of. It is taught by S. *Paul*, where he ſays, *Try all things, hold faſt that which is good.* It is taught by S. *John*, in theſe words, *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God or no.* It is taught by S. *Peter*, in theſe, *Be ye ready to render a reaſon of the hope that is in you.* Laſtly, this very pernitious Doctrine is taught by our *Saviour*, in theſe words, *If the Blind lead the Blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch.* And *why of your ſelves judge you not what is right?* All which ſpeeches, if they do not adviſe men to make uſe of their Reaſon for the choice of their Religion, I muſt confeſs my ſelf to underſtand nothing. Laſtly, not to be infinite, it is taught by M. *Knot* himſelf, not in one Page only, or Chapter of his *Book*, but all his Book over; the very writing and publiſhing whereof, ſuppoſeth this for certain, that the Readers are to be Judges, whether his Reaſons which he brings, be ſtrong and convincing; of which ſort we have hitherto met with none: or elſe captious, or impertinences, as indifferent men ſhall (as I ſuppoſe) have cauſe to judge them.

117. But you demand, *What good Stateſmen would they be, who ſhould ideate, or fancy ſuch a Commonwealth, as theſe men have*

have framed to themſelves a Church? Truly if this be all the fault they have, that they ſay. *Every man is to uſe his own judgment in the choice of his Religion, and not to believe this or that ſenſe of Scripture, upon the bare Authority of any Learned man or men, when he conceives he has reaſons to the contrary, which are of more weight than their Authority:* I know no reaſon, but notwithſtanding all this, they might be as good Stateſmen as any of the Society. But what has this to do with Common-wealths, where men are bound only to external obedience, unto the Laws and Judgments of Courts, but not to an internal approbation of them, no nor to conceal their Judgment of them, if they diſapprove them? As if I conceived I had reaſon to miſlike the Law of puniſhing ſimple Theft with Death, as Sir *Thomas Moore* did, I might profeſs lawfully my judgment, and repreſent my reaſons to the King or Common-wealth in a Parliament, as Sir *Thomas Moore* did, without committing any fault, or fearing any puniſhment.

118. To that place of S. *Auſtin* you cite (lib. 32. *cont. Fauſt. You ſee that you go about to overthrow all Authority of Scripture, and that every mans mind may be to himſelf a Rule, what he is to allow or diſallow in every Scripture:)* I ſhall need give no other Reply, but only to deſire you to ſpeak like an honeſt man, and to ſay, whether it be all one for a man, *to allow and diſallow in every Scripture what he pleaſes,* which is, either to daſh out of Scripture ſuch Texts or ſuch Chapters, becauſe they croſs his opinion? or to ſay (which is worſe,) *Though they be Scripture they are not true?* Whether, I ſay, for a man thus to allow and diſallow in Scripture what he pleaſes, be all one, and no greater fault, than to allow that ſenſe of Scripture which he conceives to be true and genuine, and deduced out of the words, and to diſallow the contrary? for Gods ſake, Sir, tell me plainly; In thoſe Texts of Scripture, which you alledge for the infallibility of your Church, do not you allow what ſenſe you think true, and diſallow the contrary? And do you not this by the direction of your private reaſon? If you do, why do you condemn it in others? If you do not, I pray you tell me what direction you follow? or whether you

follow none at all? If none at all, this is like drawing Lots, or throwing the Dice for the choice of a Religion. If any other: I beſeech you tell me what it is. Perhaps you will ſay, *the Churches Authority*; and that will be to dance finely in a round, thus, To believe the Churches Infallible Authority, becauſe the Scriptures avouch it; and to believe that Scriptures ſay and mean ſo, becauſe they are ſo expounded by the Church. Is not this for a Father to beget his Son, and the Son to beget his Father? For a foundation to ſupport the houſe, and the houſe to ſupport the foundation? Would not *Campian* have cryed out at it, *Ecce quos gyros, quos Mæandros?* And to what end was this going about, when you might as well at firſt have concluded the Church infallible becauſe ſhe ſays ſo; as thus to put in Scripture for a meer ſtale, and to ſay, the Church is infallible becauſe the Scripture ſays ſo, and the Scripture means ſo becauſe the Church ſays ſo, which is infallible? Is it not moſt evident therefore to every intelligent man, that you are enforced of neceſſity to do that your ſelf, which ſo Tragically you declaim againſt in others? The Church, you ſay, is Infallible; I am very doubtful of it: How ſhall I know it? The Scripture you ſay affirms it, as in the 59. of *Eſau, My ſpirit that is in thee, &c.* Well I confeſs I find there theſe words: but I am ſtill doubtful, whether they be ſpoken of the Church of Chriſt: and if they be, whether they mean as you pretend. You ſay, the Church ſays ſo, which is infallible. Yea but that is the Queſtion, and therefore not to be begged but proved. Neither is it ſo evident as to need no proof: otherwiſe why brought you this Text to prove it? Nor is it of ſuch a ſtrange quality, above all other Propoſitions, as to be able to prove it ſelf. What then remains but that you ſay, Reaſons drawn out of the Circumſtances of the Text, will evince that this is the ſenſe of it. Perhaps they will. But Reaſons cannot convince me, unleſs I judge of them by my Reaſon; and for every man or woman to relie on that, in the choice of their Religion, and in the interpreting of Scripture, you ſay is a horrible abſurdity; and therefore muſt neither make uſe of your own in this matter, nor deſire me to make uſe of it. 119.

119. But *Univerſal Tradition* (you ſay, and ſo do I too,) *is of it ſelf credible: and that has in all Ages taught the Churches Infallibility with full conſent.* If it have, I am ready to believe it. But that it has I hope you would not have me take upon your word: for that were to build my ſelf upon the Church, and the Church upon You. Let then the Tradition appear; for a ſecret Tradition is ſomewhat like a ſilent Thunder. You will perhaps produce, for the confirmation of it, ſome ſayings of ſome Fathers, who in every Age taught this Doctrine; (as *Gualterius* in his Chronology undertakes to do, but with ſo ill ſucceſs, that I heard an able Man of your Religion profeſs, that *in the firſt three Centuries, there was not one Authority pertinent*:) but how will you warrant that none of them teach the contrary? Again, how ſhall I be aſſured that the places have indeed this ſenſe in them? Seeing there is not one Father for 500 years after Chriſt, that does ſay in plain terms, *The Church of* Rome *is Infallible.* What, ſhall we believe your Church that this is their meaning? But this will be again to go into the Circle, which made us giddy before; To prove the Church Infallible becauſe Tradition ſays ſo, Tradition to ſay ſo, becauſe the Fathers ſay ſo, The Fathers to ſay ſo, becauſe the Church ſays ſo, which is Infallible. Yea, *but reaſon will ſhew this to be the meaning of them.* Yes, if we may uſe our Reaſon, and rely upon it. Otherwiſe, as light ſhews nothing to the Blind, or to him that uſes not his eyes; ſo reaſon cannot prove any thing to him that either has not, or uſes not his reaſon to judge of them.

120. Thus you have excluded your ſelf from all proof of your Churches Infallibility from Scripture or Tradition. And if you fly laſtly to Reaſon it ſelf for ſuccour, may not it juſtly ſay to you, as *Jephte* ſaid to his Brethren, *Ye have caſt me out and baniſhed me, and do you now come to me for ſuccour?* But if there be no certainty in Reaſon, how ſhall I be aſſured of the certainty of thoſe which you aledge for this purpoſe? Either I may judge of them, or not: if not, why do you propoſe them? If I may, why do

do you ſay I may not, and make it ſuch a monſtrous abſurdity, That men in the choice of their Religion ſhould make uſe of their Reaſon? which yet, without all queſtion, none but unreaſonable men can deny, to have been the chiefeſt end why Reaſon was given them.

121. Ad §. 22.] An Heretick *he is* (ſaith D. Potter) *who oppoſeth any truth, which to be a Divine Revelation, he is convinced in Conſcience by any means whatſoever : Be it by a Preacher or Lay-man, be it by reading Scripture, or hearing them read.* And from hence you infer, that *he makes all theſe ſafe propounders of Faith.* A moſt ſtrange and illogical deduction! For may not a private man by evident reaſon convince another man, that ſuch or ſuch a Doctrine is Divine Revelation, and yet though he be a true propounder in this point, yet propound another thing falſely, and without proof, and conſequently not be a ſafe propounder in every point? Your Preachers in their Sermons, do they not propoſe to men Divine Revelations, and do they not ſometimes convince men in Conſcience, by evident proof from Scripture, that the things they ſpeak are Divine Revelations? And whoſoever being thus convinced, ſhould oppoſe this Divine Revelation, ſhould he not be an *Heretick*, according to your own grounds, for calling Gods own Truth into queſtion? And would you think your ſelf well dealt with, if I ſhould collect from hence, that you make every Preacher a ſafe, that is, an infallible Propounder of Faith? Be the means of Propoſal what it will, ſufficient or inſufficient, worthy of credit, or not worthy, though it were, if it were poſſible, the barking of a Dog, or the chirping of a Bird, or were it the Diſcourſe of the Devil himſelf, yet if I be, I will not ſay convinced, but perſuaded, though falſly, that it is a Divine Revelation, and ſhall deny to believe it, I ſhall be a formal, though not a material *Heretick*. For he that believes, though falſly any thing to be Divine Revelation, and yet will not believe it to be true, muſt of neceſſity believe God to be falſe, which according to your own Doctrine, is the formality of an *Heretick*.

122. And

122. And how it can be any way advantagious to Civil Government, that men without warrant from God ſhould Uſurp a Tyranny over other mens Conſciences, and preſcribe unto them without reaſon, and ſometimes againſt reaſon, what they ſhall believe, you muſt ſhew us plainer if you deſire we ſhould believe. For to ſay, *Verily I do not ſee but that it muſt be ſo,* is no good demonſtration. For whereas you ſay, *that a Man may be a paſſionate and Seditious Creature,* from whence you would have us infer, that he may make uſe of his interpretation to ſatisfie his Paſſion, and raiſe Sedition: There were ſome colour in this conſequence, if we (as you do) made private men infallible interpreters for others; for then indeed they might lead Diſciples after them, and uſe them as Inſtruments for their vile purpoſes: But when we ſay they can only interpret for themſelves, what harm they can do by their paſſionate or ſeditious interpretations, but only endanger both their Temporal and Eternal happineſs, I cannot imagine. For though we deny the *Pope* or Church of *Rome* to be an infallible Judge, yet we do not deny, but that there are Judges which may proceed with certainty enough againſt all Seditious Perſons, ſuch as draw men to diſobedience either againſt Church or State, as well as againſt Rebels, and Traytors, and Thieves, and Murderers.

123. Ad §. 23.] The next § argues thus: *For many Ages there was no Scripture in the World: and for many more, there was none in many places of the World: yet men wanted not then and there ſome certain direction what to believe: Therefore there was then an Infallible Judge.* Juſt as if I ſhould ſay, *York* is not my way from *Oxford* to *London*, therefore *Briſtol* is: Or a Dog is not a Horſe, therefore he is a Man. As if God had no other ways of revealing himſelf to men, but only by Scripture and an infallible Church. *S. *Chryſoſtome* and *Iſidorus Peluſiota* conceived he might uſe other means. And S. *Paul* telleth us that the γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ *might be known by his Works*; and that *they had the Law written in their Hearts.* Either of theſe ways might make ſome faithful men without either neceſſity of Scripture or Church.

* See *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 1. *in Mat. Iſidor. Peluſ. l.* 3. *ep.* 106. and alſo *Baſil.* in *Pſ.* 28. and then you ſhall confeſs that by other means beſides theſe, God did communicate himſelf unto men and made them receive and underſtand his Laws: ſee alſo to the ſame purpoſe *Heb.* 1. 1.

124. *But*

124. *But D.* Potter *ſays* (you ſay,) *In the Jewiſh Church there was a living Judge, indowed with an abſolute infallible direction in caſes of moment: as all points belonging to Divine Faith are.* And where was that infallible direction in the Jewiſh Church when they ſhould have received Chriſt for their *Meſſias*, and refuſed him? Or perhaps this was not a caſe of moment. *D. Potter* indeed might ſay very well, not that the high Prieſt was infallible, (for certainly he was not) but that his determination was to be of neceſſity obeyed, though for the juſtice of it there was no neceſſity that it ſhould be believed. Beſides, it is one thing to ſay, that the living judge in the Jewiſh Church, had an infallible direction: another, that he was neceſſitated to follow this direction. This is the priviledge which you challenge. But it is that, not this, which the Doctor attributes to the *Jews*. As a man may truly ſay, the Wiſe men had an infallible direction to Chriſt, without ſaying or thinking that they were conſtrained to follow it, and could not do otherwiſe.

125. *But either the Church retains ſtill her infallibility, or it was deveſted of it upon the receiving of Holy Scripture; which is abſurd.* An Argument methinks like this, Either you have Horns or you have loſt them: but you never loſt them, therefore you have them ſtill. If you ſay you never had Horns; ſo ſay I, for ought appears by your reaſons, the Church never had infallibility.

126. *But ſome Scriptures were received in ſome places and not in others: therefore if Scriptures were the Judge of Controverſies, ſome Churches had one Judge and ſome another.* And what great inconvenience is there in that, that one part of *England* ſhould have one Judge, and another another? eſpecially ſeeing the Books of Scripture which were received by thoſe that received feweſt, had as much of the Doctrine of Chriſtianity in them, as they all had which were received by any; all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpel being contained in every one of the four Goſpels, as I have proved: So that they which had all the Books of the *New Teſtament* had nothing ſuperfluous: For it was not ſuperfluous but profitable, that the

ſame

ſame thing ſhould be ſaid divers times, and be teſtified by divers witneſſes: And they that had but one of the four Goſpels wanted nothing neceſſary: and therefore it is vainly inferred by you, that *with Months and Years, as new Canonical Scriptures grew to be publiſhed, the Church altered her rule of Faith and judge of Controverſies.*

127. *Hereſies*, you ſay, *would ariſe after the Apoſtles time and after the writing of Scriptures: Theſe cannot be diſcovered, condemned and avoided, unleſs the Church be Infallible; Therefore there muſt be a Church infallible.* But I pray tell me, Why cannot *Hereſies* be ſufficiently diſcovered, condemned, & avoided, by them which believe Scripture to be the rule of Faith? If Scripture be ſufficient to inform us what is the Faith, it muſt of neceſſity be alſo ſufficient to teach us what is *Hereſie*: ſeeing *Hereſie* is nothing but a manifeſt deviation from, and an oppoſition to the Faith. That which is ſtraight will plainly teach us what is crooked; and one contrary cannot but manifeſt the other. If any one ſhould deny, that there is a God: That this God is omnipotent, omniſcient, good, juſt, true, merciful, a rewarder of them that ſeek him, a puniſher of them that obſtinately offend him; that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, and the Saviour of the World: that it is he by obedience to whom men muſt look to be ſaved: If any man ſhould deny either his Birth, or Paſſion, or Reſurrection, or Aſcenſion, or ſitting at the right Hand of God: his having all Power given him in Heaven and Earth: That it is he whom God hath appointed to be Judge of the Quick and the Dead: that all men ſhall Riſe again at the laſt Day: That they which believe and repent ſhall be ſaved: That they which do not believe or repent ſhall be damned: If a man ſhould hold, that either the keeping of the *Moſaical* Law is neceſſary to Salvation: or that good works are not neceſſary to Salvation; In a word, if any man ſhould obſtinatly contradict the truth of any thing plainly delivered in Scripture, who does not ſee, that every one which believes the Scripture, hath a ſufficient means to diſcover, and condemn, and avoid that *Hereſie*, without

any need of an infallible guide? If you ſay, that *the obſcure places of Scripture contain matters of Faith*: I anſwer, that it is a matter of Faith to believe that the ſenſe of them, whatſoever it is, which was intended by God is true; for he that does not do ſo calls Gods Truth into queſtion. But to believe this or that to be the true ſenſe of them, or, to believe the true ſenſe of them, and to avoid the falſe, is not neceſſary either to Faith or Salvation. For if God would have had his meaning in theſe places certainly known, how could it ſtand with his wiſdom, to be ſo wanting to his own will and end, as to ſpeak obſcurely? or how can it conſiſt with his Juſtice, to require of men to know certainly the meaning of thoſe words, which he himſelf hath not revealed? Suppoſe there were an abſolute Monarch, that in his own abſenſe from one of his Kingdoms, had written Laws for the Government of it, ſome very plainly, and ſome very ambiguouſly, and obſcurely, and his Subjects ſhould keep thoſe that were plainly written with all exactneſs, and for thoſe that were obſcure, uſe their beſt diligence to find his meaning in them, and obey them according to the ſenſe of them which they conceived? ſhould this King either with juſtice or wiſdom be offended with theſe Subjects, if by reaſon of the obſcurity of them, they miſtook the ſenſe of them, and fail of performance, by reaſon of their Error?

128. But, *It is more uſeful & fit*, you ſay, *for the deciding of Controverſies, to have beſides an infallible Rule to go by, a living infallible Judge to determine them: & from hence* you *conclude, that certainly there is ſuch a Judge.* But why then may not another ſay, that it is yet more uſeful for many excellent purpoſes, that all the Patriarchs ſhould be infallible, than that the *Pope* only ſhould? Another, that it would be yet more uſeful, that all the Archbiſhops of every Province ſhould be ſo, than that the Patriarchs only ſhould be ſo. Another, that it would be yet more uſeful, if all the Biſhops of every Dioceſs were ſo. Another, that it would be yet more available, that all the Parſons of every Pariſh ſhould be ſo. Another,

ther, that it would be yet more excellent, if all the Fathers of Families were ſo. And laſtly, another, that it were much more to be deſired that every Man and every Woman were ſo: juſt as much as the prevention of Controverſies, is better than the deciſion of them, and the prevention of Hereſies better than the condemnation of them; and upon this ground conclude, by your own very conſequence, That not only a general Council, nor only the Pope, but all the Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Paſtors, Fathers, nay all the men in the World are infallible. If you ſay now, as I am ſure you will, that this concluſion is moſt groſs, and abſurd againſt ſenſe and experience, then muſt alſo theground be falſe, from which it evidently and undeniably follows, *viz.* that, That courſe of dealing with men ſeems always more fit to Divine Providence, which ſeems moſt fit to humane reaſon.

129. And ſo likewiſe, That there ſhould men ſucceed the Apoſtles, which could ſhew themſelves to be their ſucceſſors, by doing of Miracles, by ſpeaking all kind of Languages, by delivering men to Satan, as S. *Paul* did *Hymenæus*, and the inceſtuous *Corinthian*, it is manifeſt in human reaſon it were incomparably more fit and uſeful for the deciſion of Controverſies, than that the ſucceſſour of the Apoſtles ſhould have none of theſe gifts, and for want of the ſigns of Apoſtleſhip, be juſtly queſtionable whether he be his ſucceſſor or no: and will you now conclude, That the Popes have the gift of doing Miracles, as well as the Apoſtles had?

130. It were in all reaſon very uſeful and requiſite, that the Pope ſhould, by the aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit, be freed from the vices and paſſions of men, leſt otherwiſe, the Authority given him for the good of the Church, he might imploy (as divers Popes you well know have done) to the diſturbance, and oppreſſion and miſchief of it. And will you conclude from hence, That Popes are not ſubject to the ſins and paſſions of other men? That there never have been ambitious, covetous, luſtful, tyrannous Popes.

131. Who ſees not that for mens direction it were much more beneficial for the Church, that Infallibility ſhould

be ſetled in the Popes Perſon, than in a general Council: That ſo the means of deciding Controverſies might be ſpeedy, eaſie and perpetual, whereas that of general Councils is not ſo. And will you hence infer, that not the Church Repreſentative, but the Pope is indeed the infallible Judge of Controverſies? certainly if you ſhould, the *Sorbon* Doctors would not think this a good concluſion.

132. It had been very commodious (one would think) that, ſeeing either Gods pleaſure was the Scripture ſhould be tranſlated, or elſe in his Providence he knew it would be ſo, that he had appointed ſome men for this buſineſs, and by his Spirit aſſiſted them in it, that ſo we might have Tranſlations as Authentical as the Original: yet you ſee God did not think fit to do ſo.

133. It had been very commodious (one would think) that the Scripture ſhould have been, at leaſt for all things neceſſary, a Rule, plain and perfect: And yet you ſay, it is both imperfect and obſcure, even in things neceſſary.

134. It had been moſt requiſite (one would think) that the Copies of the Bibles, ſhould have been preſerved free from variety of Readings, which makes men very uncertain in many places, which is the Word of God, and which is the error or preſumption of man: and yet we ſee God hath not thought fit ſo to provide for us.

135. Who can conceive, but that an Apoſtolick Interpretation of all the difficult places of Scripture, would have been ſtrangely beneficial to the Church, eſpecially there being ſuch danger in miſtaking the ſenſe of them, as is by you pretended, and God in his providence foreſeeing that the greateſt part of Chriſtians, would not accept of the Pope for the Judge of Controverſies? And yet we ſee God hath not ſo ordered the matter.

136. Who doth not ſee, that ſuppoſing the Biſhop of *Rome*, had been appointed Head of the Church, and Judge of Controverſies, that it would have been infinitely beneficial to the Church, perhaps as much as all the reſt of the Bible, that in ſome Book of Scripture which was to be undoubtedly received, this one Propoſition had been ſet down in Terms, *The Biſhops of* Rome *ſhall be always Monarchs*

narchs of the Church, and they either alone, or with their adherents, the Guides of Faith, and the Judges of Controverſies that ſhall ariſe amongſt Chriſtians? This, if you will deal ingenuouſly, you cannot but acknowledge; for then all true Chriſtians would have ſubmitted to him, as willingly as to Chriſt himſelf, neither needed you and your fellows, have troubled your ſelf to invent ſo many Sophiſms for the proof of it. There would have been no more doubt of it among Chriſtians, than there is of the Nativity, Paſſion, Reſurrection or Aſcenſion of Chriſt. You were beſt now rub your forehead hard, and conclude upon us, that becauſe this would have been ſo uſeful to have been done, therefore it is done. Or if you be (as I know you are) too ingenuous to ſay ſo, then muſt you acknowledge, that the ground of your Argument, which is the very ground of all theſe abſurdities, is moſt abſurd; and that it is our duty to be humbly thankful for thoſe ſufficient, nay abundant means of Salvation, which God hath of his own goodneſs granted us: and not conclude, he hath done that which he hath not done, becauſe forſooth, in our vain judgments it ſeems convenient he ſhould have done ſo.

137. But you demand *what repugnance there is betwixt infallibility in the Church, and exiſtence of Scripture, that the production of the one muſt be the deſtruction of the other?* Out of which words I can frame no other argument for you than this. *There is no Repugnance between the Scriptures exiſtence, and the Churches infallibility, therefore the Church is infallible.* Which conſequence will then be good, when you can ſhew, that nothing can be untrue, but that only which is impoſſible; that whatſoever may be done, that alſo is done. Which, if it were true, would conclude both you and me to be infallible, as well as either your Church, or Pope: in as much as there is no more repugnance between the Scriptures exiſtence and our infallibility, than there is between theirs.

138. Obj. *But if Proteſtants will have the Scripture alone for their Judge, let them firſt produce ſome Scripture, affirming, that by the entrance thereof, infallibility went out of the Church.* *Anſ.*

Anſ. This Argument put in form runs thus. No Scripture affirms that by the entring thereof, infallibility went out of the Church: Therefore there is an infallible Church, and therefore the Scripture alone is not Judge, that is, the Rule to judge by. But as no Scripture affirms that by the entring of it, Infallibility went out of the Church, ſo neither do we, neither have we any need to do ſo. But we ſay, that it continued in the Church even together with the Scriptures, ſo long as Chriſt and his Apoſtles were living, and then departed: God in his providence having provided a plain and infallible Rule, to ſupply the defect of living and infallible Guides.

141. *But the Jewiſh Church retained Infallibility in her ſelf; and therefore it is unjuſt to deprive the Church of Chriſt of it.*

Anſ. That the Jews had ſometimes an infallible miraculous direction from God, in ſome caſes of moment, he doth affirm and had good warrant: but that the Synagogue was abſolutely Infallible, he no where affirms, and therefore it is unjuſtly and unworthily done of you to obtrude it upon him. And indeed how can the Infallibility of the Synagogue be conceived, but only by ſetling it in the High Prieſt, and the company adhering and ſubordinate unto him? And whether the High Prieſt was Infallible, when he believed not Chriſt to be the *Meſſias*, but condemned and excommunicated them that ſo profeſſed, and cauſed him to be crucified for ſaying ſo, I leave it to Chriſtians to judge. But then ſuppoſe God had been ſo pleaſed to do as he did not, to appoint the Synagouge an infallible guide: Could you by your rules of Logick conſtrain him, to appoint ſuch a one to Chriſtians alſo, or ſay unto him, that, in wiſdom he could not do otherwiſe? Vain man that will be thus always tying God to your imaginations! It is well for us that he leaves us not without directions to him, but if he will do this ſometime by living Guides, ſometime by written Rules, what is that to you? may not he do what he will with his own?

144. *Ad §.* 24. Neither is this Diſcourſe (if you mean your Concluſion, that *Your Church is the infallible Judge*

in

in Controverſies) confirmed by *Irenæus* at all *(Iren.* l. 3. c. 3.) For neither has *Irenæus* one ſyllable to this purpoſe, neither can it be deduced out of what he ſays, with any colour of conſequence. For firſt in ſaying, *What if the Apoſtles had not left Scripture, ought we not to have followed the Order of Tradition?* And in ſaying, *That to this Order many Nations yield aſſent, who believe in Chriſt, having Salvation written in their hearts, by the Spirit of God, without Letters or Ink, and diligently keeping ancient Tradition:* Doth he not plainly ſhew, that the Tradition he ſpeaks of, is nothing elſe, but the very ſame that is written: nothing but to believe in Chriſt? To which, whether Scripture alone to them that believe it, be not a ſufficient guide, I leave it to you to judge. And are not his words juſt as if a man ſhould ſay, If God had not given us the light of the Sun, we muſt have made uſe of Candles and Torches: If we had had no Eyes, we muſt have felt out our way: If we had no Leggs, we muſt have uſed Crutches. And doth not this in effect import, that while we have the Sun, we need no Candles? While we have our Eyes, we need not feel out our way? While we enjoy our Leggs, we need not Crutches? And by like reaſon, *Irenæus* in ſaying, *If we had no Scripture, we muſt have followed Tradition, and they that have none, do well to do ſo,* doth he not plainly import, that to them that have Scripture, and believe it, Tradition is unneceſſary? which could not be, if the Scripture did not contain evidently the whole tradition. Which whether *Irenæus* believed or no, theſe words of his may inform you, *Non enim per alios* &c. *we have received the diſpoſition of our Salvation from no others, but from them, by whom the Goſpel came unto us. Which Goſpel truly, the Apoſtles firſt preached, and afterwards by the will of God, delivered in writing to us, to be the Pillar and Foundation of our Faith.* Upon which place *Bellarmine's* two obſervations, and his acknowledgment enſuing upon them, are very conſiderable, and as I conceive, as home to my purpoſe as I would wiſh them. His firſt *Notandum* is, *That in the Chriſtian Doctrin, ſome things are ſimply neceſſary for the Salvation of all men; as the knowledge of the Articles of the Apoſtles.*

Bellarm. de verbo Dei L. 4. c. 11.

Apoſtles Creed; and beſides the knowledge, of the ten Commandments, and ſome of the Sacraments. Other things not ſo neceſſary, but that a man may be ſaved, without the explicit knowledge and belief, and profeſſion of them. His Second Note is, *That thoſe things which were ſimply neeeſſary, the Apoſtles were wont to preach to all men; But of other things not all to all, but ſomething to all, to wit, thoſe things which were profitable for all, other things only to Prelats and Prieſts.* Theſe things premiſed, he acknowledgeth, *That all thoſe things were written by the Apoſtles, which are neceſſary for all, and which they were wont openly to preach to all; But that other things were not all written: And therefore, when* Irenæus *ſays that the Apoſtles wrote what they Preach in the World, it is true,* ſaith he, *and not againſt Traditions, becauſe they preached not to the People all things, but only thoſe things, which were neceſſary or profitable for them.*

145. So that at the moſt, you can infer from hence, but only a ſuppoſitive neceſſity of having an infallible Guide, and that grounded upon a falſe ſuppoſition, In caſe we had no Scripture, but an abſolute neceſſity hereof, and to them who have and believe the Scripture, which is your aſſumption, cannot with any colour from hence be concluded, but rather the contrary.

146. Neither becauſe (as he ſays) it was *then eaſie to receive the Truth from Gods Church, then,* in the Age next after the Apoſtles, Then, when all the ancient and Apoſtolick Churches were at an agreement about the Fundamentals of Faith: Will it therefore follow that now, 1600 years after, when the ancient Churches are divided almoſt into as many Religions as they are Churches, every one being the Church to it ſelf, and heretical to all other, that it is as eaſie, but extremely difficult or rather impoſſible, to find the Church firſt independently of the true Doctrin, and then to find the truth by the Church.

148. Neither will the *Apoſtles depoſiting with the Church, all things belonging to truth,* be any proof that the Church ſhall certainly keep this *depoſitum,* entire, and ſincere, without adding to it, or taking from it; for this whole *depoſitum* was committed to every particular Church, nay, to every

every particular Man, which the Apoſtles converted. And yet no man, I think, will ſay, that there was any certainty, that it ſhould be kept whole and inviolate by every man, and every Church. It is apparent out of Scripture, it was committed to *Timothy*, and by him conſigned to other faithful men: and yet S. *Paul* thought it not ſuperfluous, earneſtly to exhort him to the careful keeping of it: which exhortation you muſt grant had been vain and ſuperfluous, if the not keeping of it had been impoſſible. And therefore though *Irenæus* ſays, *The Apoſtles fully depoſited in the Church all truth*, yet he ſays not, neither can we infer from what he ſays, that the Church ſhould always infallibly keep this *depoſitum*, entire without the loſs of any truth, and ſincere without the mixture of any falſhood.

149. Ad §. 25.] *C. M.* proceeds and tells us, *That beſide all this, the Doctrine of* Proteſtants *is deſtructive of it ſelf. For either they have certain and infallible means not to Err in interpreting; or not. If not, Scripture to them cannot be a ſufficient ground for infallible Faith: If they have, and ſo cannot Err in interpreting Scripture, then they are able with infallibility to hear and determine all Controverſies of Faith; and ſo they may be, and are Judges of Controverſies, although they uſe the Scripture as a Rule. And thus againſt their own Doctrine, they conſtitute another Judge of Controverſies beſides Scripture alone.*

C. H. And may not we with as much reaſon ſubſtitute Church and *Papiſts*, inſtead of Scripture and *Proteſtants*, and ſay unto you, Beſides all this, the Doctrine of *Papiſts* is deſtructive of it ſelf. For either they have certain and infallible means not to Err, in the choice of the Church, and interpreting her decrees, or they have not: If not, then the Church to them cannot be a ſufficient (but meerly a phantaſtical) ground for infallible Faith, nor a meet Judge of Controverſies: (For unleſs I be infallibly ſure that the Church is infallible, how can I be upon her Authority infallibly ſure, that any thing ſhe ſays is infallible?) If they have certain infallible means, and ſo cannot Err in the choice of their Church, and in

interpreting her decrees, then they are able with Infallibility to hear, examine, and determine all Controverſies of Faith, although they pretend to make the Church their Guide, And thus againſt their own Doctrine, they conſtitute another Judge of Controverſies, beſides the Church alone. Nay every one makes himſelf a chooſer of his own Religion, and of his own ſenſe of the Churches decrees, which very thing in *Proteſtants* they ſo highly condemn: and ſo in judging others, condemn themſelves.

150. Neither in ſaying thus have I only cried quittance with you: but that you may ſee how much you are in my debt, I will ſhew unto you, that for your Sophiſm againſt our way, I have given you a Demonſtration againſt yours. Firſt, I ſay, your Argument againſt us, is a tranſparent fallacy. The firſt part of it lies thus: *Proteſtants* have no means to interpret, without Error, obſcure and ambiguous places of Scripture; therefore plain places of Scripture cannot be to them a ſufficient ground of Faith. But though we pretend not to certain means of not Erring, in interpreting all Scripture, particularly ſuch places as are obſcure and ambiguous, yet this methinks ſhould be no impediment but that we may have certainmeans of not Erring in and about the ſenſe of thoſe places, which are ſo plain and clear that they need no Interpreters; and in ſuch we ſay our Faith is contained. If you ask me how I can be ſure that I know the true meaning of theſe places? I ask you again, can you be ſure that you underſtand what I, or any man elſe ſays? They that heard our Saviour and the Apoſtles Preach, could they have ſufficient aſſurance, that they underſtood at any time, what they would have them do? if not, to what end did they hear them? If they could, why may we not be as well aſſured, that we underſtand ſufficiently, what we conceive plain in their writings?

151. Again I pray tell us, whether you do certainly know the ſenſe of theſe Scriptures, with which you pretend you are led to the knowledg of your Church? If you do not, how know you that there is any Church Infallible, and that theſe are the Notes of it, and that, this

this is the Church that hath theſe Notes? If you do, then give us leave to have the ſame means, and the ſame abilities to know other plain places, which you have to know theſe. For if all Scripture be obſcure, how come you to know the ſenſe of theſe places? If ſome places of it be plain, why ſhould we ſtay here?

152. And now, to come to the other part of your dilemma; in ſaying, *If they have certain means, and ſo cannot Err*, methinks you forget your ſelf very much, and ſeem to make no difference, between, having certain means to do a thing, and the actual doing of it. As if you ſhould conclude, becauſe all men have certain means of Salvation, therefore all men certainly muſt be ſaved, and cannot do otherwiſe; as if whoſoever had a Horſe muſt preſently get up and Ride; Whoſoever had means to find out a way, could not neglect thoſe means and ſo miſtake it, God be thanked, that we have ſufficient means to be certain enough of the truth of our Faith. But the Priviledge of not being in poſſibility of Erring, that we challenge not, becauſe we have as little reaſon as you to do ſo: and you have none at all. If you ask, ſeeing we may poſſibly Err, how can we be aſſured we do not? I ask you again, ſeeing your Eye-ſight may deceive you, how can you be ſure you ſee the Sun, when you do ſee it? Perhaps you may be in a dream, and perhaps you, and all the men in the World have been ſo, when they thought they were awake, and then only awake, when they thought they Dreamt. But this I am ſure of, as ſure as that God is good, that he will require no impoſſibilities of us: not an Infallible, nor a certainly-unerring belief, unleſs he hath given us certain means to avoid Error; and if we uſe thoſe which we have, will never require of us, that we uſe that which we have not.

153. Now from this miſtaken ground, that it is all one to have means of avoiding Error, and to be in no danger nor poſſibility of Error; You infer upon us as an abſurd concluſion, *That we make our ſelves able to determine Controverſies of Faith with Infallibility, and Judges of Controverſies.* For the latter part of this inference, we ac-

knowledge and embrace it. We do make our ſelves Judges of Controverſies: that is, we do make uſe of our own underſtanding in the choice of our Religion. But this, if it be a crime, is common to us with you, (as I have proved above) and the difference is, not that we are chooſers, and you not chooſers, but that we, as we conceive, chooſe wiſely, but you being wilfully blind chooſe to follow thoſe that are ſo too; not remembring what our Saviour hath told you, *when the Blind lead the Blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch.* But then again I muſt tell you, you have done ill to confound together, Judges, and infallible Judges; unleſs you will ſay, either that we have no Judges in our Courts of Civil judicature, or that they are all Infallible.

154. Thus have we caſt off your dilemma, and broken both the Horns of it. But now my retortion lies heavy upon you, and will not be turned off. For firſt you content not your ſelves with a moral certainty of the things you believe, nor with ſuch a degree of aſſurance of them, as is ſufficient to produce obedience to the condition of the new Covenant, which is all that we require. Gods Spirit, if he pleaſe, may Work more, and certainty of adherence beyond a certainty of evidence. But neither God doth, nor man may require of us, as our Duty, to give a greater aſſent to the concluſion than the premiſes deſerve; to build an infallible Faith upon Motives that are only highly credible, and not infallible, as it were a great and heavy building upon a Foundation that hath not ſtrength proportionable. But though God require not of us ſuch unreaſonable things, You do, and tell men they cannot be ſaved, unleſs they believe your Propoſals with an infallible Faith. To which end they muſt believe alſo your Propounder, your Church, to be ſimply Infallible. Now how is it poſſible for them to give a rational aſſent to the Churches infallibility, unleſs they have ſome infallible means to know that ſhe is infallible? Neither can they infallibly know the infallibility of this means, but by ſome other, and ſo on for ever: unleſs they can dig ſo deep as to come at length to the Rock, that is, *to ſettle all upon ſomething evident of it ſelf*, which is

is not ſo much as pretended. But the laſt reſolution of all is into Motives, which indeed upon examination will ſcarce appear probable, but are not ſo much as avouched to be any more than very credible. For example, if I ask you why you do believe Tranſubſtantiation? What can you anſwer, but becauſe it is a Revelation of the prime Verity. I demand again, how can you aſſure your ſelf or me of that, being ready to embrace it if it may appear to be ſo? And what can you ſay, but that you know it to be ſo, becauſe the Church ſays ſo, which is Infallible. If I ask, what mean You by your Church? You can tell me nothing, but the Company of Chriſtians which adhere to the *Pope*. I demand then laſtly: Why ſhould I believe this Company to be the Infallible Propounder of Divine Revelation? And then you tell me, that there are many Motives to induce a Man to this belief. But are theſe Motives laſtly infallible? No ſay you, but very credible. Well, let them paſs for ſuch, becauſe now we have not leiſure to examine them. Yet methinks ſeeing the Motives to believe the Churches infallibility, are only very credible, it ſhould alſo be but as credible that your Church is Infallible, and as credible, and no more, perhaps ſomewhat leſs, that her Propoſals, particularly Tranſubſtantiation, are Divine Revelations. And methinks You ſhould require only a Moral, and Modeſt aſſent to them, and not a Divine as you call it, and Infallible Faith. But then of theſe Motives to the Churches Infallibility, I hope you will give us leave to conſider, and judge whether they be indeed Motives, and ſufficient; or whether they be not Motiues at all, or not ſufficient; or whether theſe Motives or Inducements to your Church be not impeached, and oppoſed with Compulſives, and enforcements, from it; or laſtly, whether theſe Motives which You uſe, be not indeed only Motives to Chriſtianity, and not to *Popery*: give me leave for diſtinction ſake to call your Religion ſo. If we may not judge of theſe things, how can my judgment be moved with that which comes not within its cognizance? If I may, then at leaſt I am to be a Judge of all theſe Con-

Controverſies. 1. Whether every one of theſe Motives be indeed a Motive to any Church? 2. If to ſome, whether to Yours? 3. If to Yours, whether ſufficient, or inſufficient? 4. Whether other Societies have not as many, and as great Motives to draw me to them? 5. Whether I have not greater reaſon to believe you do Err, than that you cannot? And now Sir I pray let me trouble You with a few more Queſtions. Am I a ſufficient Judge of theſe Controverſies, or no? If of theſe, why ſhall I ſtay here, why not of others? Why not of all? Nay doth not the true examining of theſe few, contain and lay upon me the examination of all? What other Motives to your Church have you, but your Notes of it? *Bellarmine* gives ſome 14. or 15. And one of theſe fifteen contains in it the examination of all Controverſies, and not only ſo, but of all uncontroverted Doctrines. For how ſhall I, or can I know the Church of *Romes* conformity with the Ancient Church, unleſs I know firſt what the Ancient Church did hold, and then what the Church of *Rome* doth hold; and laſtly, whether they be conformable, or if in my judgment they ſeem not conformable, I am then to think the Church of *Rome* not to be the Church, for want of the Note which ſhe pretends is proper, and perpetual to it. So that for ought I can ſee, Judges we are and muſt be of all ſides, every one for himſelf, and God for us all.

155. §. 26.] C. M. *I aſk, whether this Aſſertion (Scripture alone is Judge of all Controverſies in Faith) be a Fundamental point of Faith or no?*

CHIL. I anſwer; This aſſertion, that *Scripture alone is Judge of all Controverſies in Faith*, if it be taken properly, is neither a Fundamental nor Unfundamental point of Faith, nor no point of Faith at all, but a plain falſhood. It is not *a Judge of Controverſies but a Rule to Judge them by*; and that not an abſolutely perfect Rule, but as perfect as a written Rule can be; which muſt always need ſomething elſe, which is either evidently true, or evidently credible to give atteſtation to it, and that in this caſe is Univerſal Tradition. So that Univerſal Tradition

dition is the Rule to judge all Controverſies by. But then becauſe nothing beſides Scripture, comes to us with as full a ſtream of Tradition as Scripture, Scripture alone, and no unwritten Doctrine, nor no Infallibility of any Church, having atteſtation from Tradition truly Univerſal; for this reaſon we conceive, as the Apoſtles perſons while they were living were the only Judges of Controverſies, ſo their Writings, now they are dead, are the only Rule for us to judge them by: There being nothing unwritten, which can go in upon half ſo fair Cards, for the Title of Apoſtolick Tradition, as theſe things which by the confeſſion of both Sides are not ſo: I mean *the Doctrine of the Millinaries*, and *of the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants.*

156. Yet when we ſay, the Scripture is the only Rule to Judge all Controverſies by, methinks you ſhould eaſily conceive, that we would be underſtood of all thoſe that are poſſible to be Judged by Scripture, and of thoſe that ariſe among ſuch as believe the Scripture. For if I had a Controverſie with an *Atheiſt* whether there were a God or no, I would not ſay, that the Scripture were a Rule to judge this by: ſeeing that doubting whether there be a God or no, he muſt needs doubt whether the Scripture be the Word of God: or if he does not, he grants the Queſtion, and is not the man we ſpeak of. So likewiſe, if I had a Controverſie about the Truth of Chriſt with a *Jew*, it would be vainly done of me, ſhould I preſs him with the Authority of the *New Teſtament* which he believes not, until out of ſome Principles common to us both, I had perſuaded him that it is the Word of God. The *New Teſtament* therefore while he remains a *Jew* would not be a fit Rule to decide this Controverſie; In as much as that which is doubted of it ſelf, is not fit to determine other doubts. So likewiſe if there were any that believed Chriſtian Religion, and yet believed not the Bible to be the Word of God, though they believed the matter of it to be true, (which is no impoſſible ſuppoſition, for I may believe a Book of S. *Auſtines*, to contain nothing but the Truth of God, and yet not to have been

been inſpired by God himſelf,) againſt ſuch men therefore there were no diſputing out of the Bible; becauſe nothing in queſtion can be a proof to it ſelf. When therefore we ſay the Scripture is a ſufficient means to determine all Controverſies, we ſay not this, either to *Atheiſts, Jews, Turks,* or ſuch Chriſtians (if there be any ſuch) as believe not Scripture to be the Word of God. But among ſuch men only, as are already agreed upon this, That the Scripture is the Word of God, we ſay all Controverſies that ariſe about Faith, are either not at all decidable and conſequently not neceſſary to be believed one way or other, or they may be determined by Scripture. In a Word, That all things neceſſary to be believed are evidently contained in Scripture, and what is not there evidently contained, cannot be neceſſary to be believed. And our reaſon hereof is convincing; becauſe nothing can Challenge our belief, but what hath deſcended to us from Chriſt by Original and Univerſal Tradition: Now nothing but Scripture hath thus deſcended to us, Therefore nothing but Scripture can Challenge our belief. Now then to come up cloſer to you, and to anſwer to your Queſtion, not as you put it, but as you ſhould have put it: I ſay, That this poſition, *Scripture alone is the Rule whereby they which believe it to be Gods Word are to judge all Controverſies in Faith,* is no fundamental point. Though not for your Reaſons: For your firſt and ſtrongeſt reaſon you ſee is plainly voided and cut off by my ſtating of the Queſtion as I have done, and ſuppoſing in it that the parties at variance are agreed about this, That the Scripture is the Word of God; and conſequently that this is none of their Controverſies. To your ſecond, That *Controverſies cannot be ended without ſome living Authority,* We have ſaid already, that neceſſary Controverſies may be and are decided. And if they be not ended, this is not through defect of the Rule, but through the default of Men. And for theſe that cannot thus be ended, it is not neceſſary they ſhould be ended. For if God did require the ending of them, he would have provided ſome certain means for the ending of them. And to your Third, I ſay, that

your

your pretence of uſing theſe means is but hypocrital: for you uſe them with prejudice, and with a ſetled reſolution not to believe any thing which theſe means happily may ſuggeſt into you, if it any way croſs your pre-conceived perſwaſion of your Churches infallibility. You give not your ſelves liberty of judgment in the uſe of them, nor ſuffer your ſelves to be led by them to the Truth, to which they would lead you, would you but be as willing to believe this conſequence, Our Church doth oppoſe Scripture, therefore it doth err, therefore it is not Infallible, as you are reſolute to believe this, The Church is Infallible, therefore it doth not err, and therefore it doth not oppoſe Scripture, though it ſeem to do ſo never ſo plainly.

157. You pray, but it is not that God would bring you to the true Religion, but that he would confirm you in your own. You confer places, but it is that you may confirm, or colour over with plauſible diſguiſes your erroneous doctrine, not that you may judge of them and forſake them if there be reaſon for it. You conſult the Originals, but you regard them not when they make againſt your Doctrin or Tranſlation.

159. Notwithſtanding, though not for theſe reaſons, yet for others, I conceive this Doctrin not Fundamental: Becauſe if a man ſhould believe Chriſtian Religion wholly, and entirely, and live according to it, ſuch a man, though he ſhould not know or not believe the Scripture to be a Rule of Faith, no nor to be the Word of God, my opinion is he may be ſaved; and my reaſon is, becauſe he performs the entire condition of the new Covenant, which is, that we believe the matter of the Goſpel, and not that it is contained in theſe or theſe Books. So that the Books of Scripture are not ſo much the objects of our Faith, as the inſtruments of conveying it to our underſtanding; and not ſo much of the being of the Chriſtian Doctrin, as requiſite to the well-being of it. *Irænens* tells us (as M. K. acknowledgeth) of ſome barbarous Nations, that *believed the Doctrin of Chriſt, and yet believed not the Scripture to be the Word of God, for they never heard of it, and Faith comes by hearing:* But theſe barbarous people might be ſaved:

therefore men might be ſaved without believing the Scripture to be the Word of God; much more without believing it to be a Rule, and a perfect Rule of Faith. Neither doubt I, but if the Books of Scripture had been propoſed to them by the other parts of the Church, where they had been before received, and had been doubted of, or even rejected by thoſe barbarous Nations, but ſtill by the bare belief and practice of Chriſtianity, they might be ſaved: God requiring of us under pain of damnation, only to believe the verities therein contained, and not the divine Authority of the Books wherein they are contained. Not but that it were now very ſtrange and unreaſonable, if a man ſhould believe the matter of theſe Books, and not the Authority of the Books: and therefore if a man ſhould profeſs the not believing of theſe, I ſhould have reaſon to fear he did not believe that. But there is not always an equal neceſſity for the belief of thoſe things, for the belief whereof there is an equal reaſon. We have I believe as great reaſon to believe there was ſuch a man as *Henry the VIII. King of England*, as that *Jeſus Chriſt* ſuffered under *Pontius Pilate:* yet this is neceſſary to be believed, and that is not ſo. So that if any man ſhould doubt of or diſbelieve that, it were moſt unreaſonably done of him, yet it were no mortal ſin, nor no ſin at all: God having no where commanded men under pain of damnation to believe all which reaſon induceth them to believe. Therefore as an Executor, that ſhould perform the whole Will of the dead, ſhould fully ſatisfie the Law, though he did not believe that Parchment to be his written Will, which indeed is ſo: So I believe, that he who believes all the particular doctrines which integrate Chriſtianity, and lives according to them, ſhould be ſaved, though he neither believed nor knew that the Goſpels were written by the Evangeliſts, or the Epiſtles by the Apoſtles.

160. This diſcourſe whether it be rational and concluding or no, I ſubmit to better judgment; But ſure I am, that the corollary which you draw from this poſition, *that this point is not Fundamental*, is very inconſequent; that is, *that we are uncertain of the truth of it*, becauſe we ſay the whole

whole Church, much more particular Churches and private men may err in points not Fundamental. A pretty Sophiſm, depending upon this Principle, that whoſoever poſſibly may err, he cannot be certain that he doth not err. And upon this ground, what ſhall hinder me from concluding, that ſeeing you alſo hold, that neither particular Churches, nor private men are Infallible even in Fundamentals, that even the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, remain to you uncertain? A Judge may poſſibly err in judgment, can he therefore never have aſſurance that he hath judged right? A Traveller may poſſibly miſtake his way, muſt I therefore be doubtful whether I am in the right way from my Hall to my Chamber? Or can our *London* Carrier have no certainty, in the middle of the day, when he is ſober and in his wits, that he is in the way to *London*? Theſe you ſee are right worthy conſequences, and yet they are as like your own, as an Egg to an Egg, or Milk to Milk.

163. Ad §. 27.] C. M. *S.* Auſtin *plainly affirms that to oppoſe the Churches definitions is to reſiſt God himſelf* (*ſpeaking of the Controverſie of Rebaptization* de Unit. Eccl. cap. 22.) where he ſaith *that Chriſt bears witneſs to his Church, and whoſoever refuſeth to follow the practice of the Church, doth reſiſt our Saviour himſelf, who by his teſtimony recommends the Church, &c.*

CHIL. I Anſwer, Firſt that in many things you will not be tried by S. *Auguſtines* judgment, nor ſubmit to his authority; not concerning Appeals to *Rome*, not concerning Tranſubſtantiation, not touching the uſe and worſhiping of Images, not concerning the State of Saints ſouls before the day of judgment, not touching the Virgin *Maries* freedom from actual and original ſin, not touching the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants, not touching the damning Infants to Hell that die without Baptiſm, not touching the knowledge of Saints departed, not touching Purgatory, not touching the fallibility of Councils, even general Councils, not touching perfection and perſpicuity of Scripture in matters neceſſary to Salvation, not touching Auricular Confeſſion, not touching the half Communion

nion, not touching Prayers in an unknown tongue; In theſe things, I ſay, you will not ſtand to S. *Auſtines* judgment, and therefore can with no reaſon or equity require us to do ſo in this matter. 2. To S. *Auguſtine* in heat of diſputation againſt the *Donatiſts*, and ranſacking all places for arguments againſt them, we oppoſe S. *Auſtine* out of this heat, delivering the doctrine of Chriſtianity calmly, and moderately; where he ſays, *In iis quæ apertè poſita ſunt in ſacris Scripturis, omnia ea reperiuntur quæ continent fidem, moreſque vivendi.* 3. We ſay, he ſpeaks not of the *Roman* but the *Catholick Church*, of far greater extent, and therefore of far greater credit and authority than the *Roman* Church. 4. He ſpeaks of a point not expreſſed, but yet not contradicted by Scripture; whereas the errors we charge you with, are contradicted by Scripture. 5. He ſays not that Chriſt has recommended the Church to us for *an Infallible definer of all emergent controverſies*, but for a *credible witneſs of Ancient Tradition.* Whoſoever therefore refuſeth to follow the practice of the Church (underſtand *of all places and ages)* though he be thought to reſiſt our Saviour, what is that to us, who caſt off no practiecs of the Church, but ſuch as are evidently poſt-nate to the time of the Apoſtles, and plainly contrary to the practice of former and purer times. Laſtly it is evident, and even to impudence it ſelf undeniable, that upon this ground, of believing all things taught by the preſent Church as taught by Chriſt, Error was held, for example, the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants, and that in S. *Auſtines* time, and that by S. *Auſtine* himſelf: and therefore without controverſie this is no certain ground for truth, which may ſupport falſhood as well as truth.

164. To the Argument wherewith you conclude, I Anſwer, That though the viſible Church ſhall always without fail propoſe ſo much of Gods revelation, as is ſufficient to bring men to Heaven, for otherwiſe it will not be the viſible Church, yet it may ſometimes add to this revelation things ſuperfluous, nay hurtful, nay in themſelves damnable, though not unpardonable; and ſometimes take from it things very expedient and profitable, and therefore

it

it is poſſible, without ſin, to reſiſt in ſome things the Viſible Church of Chriſt. But you preſs us farther, and demand, *what Viſible Church was extant, when* Luther *began, whether it were the* Roman *or* Proteſtant *Church?* As if it muſt of neceſſity either be *Proteſtant* or *Roman*, or *Roman* of neceſſity, if it were not *Proteſtant!* yet this is the moſt uſual fallacy of all your diſputers, by ſome ſpecious Arguments to perſwade weak men that the Church of *Proteſtants* cannot be the true Church; and thence to infer, that without doubt it muſt be the *Roman*. But why may not the *Roman* be content to be a part of it, and the *Grecian* another? And if one muſt be the whole, why not the *Greek* Church, as well as the *Roman?* there being not one Note of your Church which agrees not to her as well as to your own; unleſs it be, that ſhe is poor, and oppreſſed by the *Turk*, and you are in glory and ſplendor.

CHAP. III.

The ANSWER to the Third CHAPTER.

Wherein it is maintained, That the diſtinction of points Fundamental *and not* Fundamental, *is in this preſent Controverſie good and pertinent: And that the Catholick Church may err in the latter kind of the ſaid points.*

1. THis diſtinction is imployed by *Proteſtants* to many purpoſes, and therefore if it be pertinent and good, (as they underſtand and apply it) the whole Edifice built thereon, muſt be either firm and ſtable, or if it be not, it cannot be for any default in this diſtinction.

2. *If you object to them diſcords in matter of faith without any means of agreement*, They will anſwer you, that they want not good and ſolid means of agreement in matters neceſſary to ſalvation, *viz.* Their belief of all thoſe things which are plainly and undoubtedly delivered in Scripture; which who ſo believes, muſt of neceſſity believe all things neceſſary to ſalvation: and their mutual ſuffering one another,

another, *to abound in their ſeveral ſenſe*, in matters not plainly aud undoubtedly there delivered. And for their agreement in all Controverſies of Religion, either they have means to agree about them, or not: If you ſay they have, why did you before deny it? If they have not means, why do you find fault with them, for not agreeing?

3. You will ſay, that their fault is, that by *remaining* Proteſtants *they exclude themſelves from the means of agreement, which you have*, and which by ſubmiſſion to your Church they might have alſo. But if you have means of agreement, the more ſhame for you that you ſtill diſagree. For who, I pray, is more inexcuſably guilty, for the omiſſion of any duty; they that either have no means to do it, or elſe know of none they have, which puts them in the ſame caſe as if they had none: or they which profeſs to have an eaſie and expedite means to do it, and yet ſtill leave it undone? *If you had been blind* (ſaith our *Saviour* to the *Phariſees*) *you had had no ſin, but now you ſay you ſee, therefore your ſin remaineth.*

4. If you ſay, you *do agree in matters of Faith*, I ſay this is ridiculous: for you define matters of Faith to be thoſe wherein you agree. So that to ſay, you agree in *matters of Faith*, is to ſay, you agree in thoſe things wherein you do agree. And do not *Proteſtants* do ſo likewiſe? Do not they agree in thoſe things, wherein they do agree?

5. But *you are all agreed that only thoſe things wherein you do agree are matters of Faith.* And *Proteſtants* if they were wiſe, would do ſo too. Sure I am they have reaſon enough to do ſo: ſeeing all of them agree with explicite Faith in all thoſe things, which are plainly and undoubtedly delivered in Scripture, that is, in all which God hath plainly revealed: and with an implicite Faith, in that ſenſe of the whole Scripture which God intended whatſoever it was. Secondly, That which you pretend is falſe; for elſe, why do ſome of you hold it againſt Faith, to take or allow the *Oath of Allegiance*, others as learned and honeſt as they, that it is againſt Faith and unlawful to refuſe it and allow the refuſing of it? Why do ſome of you hold, that it is *de Fide*, that the Pope is Head of the Church by divine Law,

Law, others the contrary? Some hold it *de Fide*, that the Bleſſed Virgin was free from Actual ſin, others that it is not ſo. Some, that the *Popes* indirect power over Princes in temporalties is *de Fide*, Others the contrary. Some, that it is Univerſal Tradition, and conſequently *de Fide*, that the *Virgin Mary* was conceived in original ſin, others the contrary.

6. But what ſhall we ſay now, if you be not agreed touching your pretended means of agreement, how then can you pretend to Unity either Actual or Potential more than *Proteſtants* may? Some of you ſay, the *Pope* alone without a Council may determine all Controverſies: But others deny it. Some, that a General Council without a *Pope* may do ſo: Others deny this. Some, Both in conjunction are infallible determiners: Others again deny this. Laſtly, ſome among you, hold the Acceptation of the decrees of Councils by the Univerſal Church to be the only way to decide Controverſies: which others deny, by denying the Church to be Infallible. And indeed what way of ending Cotroverſies can this be, when either part may pretend, that they are part of the Church, and they receive not the decree, therefore the whole Church hath not received it?

7. Again, Means of agreeing differences are either Rational and well grounded and of Gods appointment, or voluntary and taken up at the pleaſure of men. Means of the former nature, we ſay, you have as little as we. For where hath God appointed, that the *Pope*, or a Council, or a Council confirmed by the *Pope*, or that Society of Chriſtians which adhere to him, ſhall be the *Infallible Judge of Controverſies*. I deſire you to ſhew any one of theſe Aſſertions plainly ſet down in Scripture, (as in all Reaſon a thing of this nature ſhould be) or at leaſt delivered with a full conſent of Fathers, or at leaſt taught in plain terms by any one Father for four Hundred years after *Chriſt*. And if you cannot do this (as I am ſure you cannot) and yet will ſtill be obtruding your ſelves upon us for our Judges, who will not cry out, ---*periſſe frontem de rebus*? that you have loſt all modeſty?

8. But

8. But then for means of the other kind, ſuch as yours are, we have great abundance of them. For beſides all the ways which you have deviſed, which we may make uſe of when we pleaſe, we have a great many more, which you yet have never thought of, for which we have as good colour out of Scripture as you have for yours. For firſt, we could if we would, try it by Lots, whoſe Doctrine is true, and whoſe falſe. And you know it is written, [a] *The Lot is caſt into the Lap, but the whole diſpoſition of it is from the Lord.* 2. We could refer them to the King, and you know it is written: [b] *A Divine ſentence is in the Lips of the King, his mouth tranſgreſſeth not in judgment.* [c] *The Heart of the King is in the hand of the Lord.* We could refer the matter to any aſſembly of Chriſtians aſſembled in the name of Chriſt, ſeeing it is written, *where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.* We may refer it to any Prieſt, becauſe it is written, [e] *The Prieſts Lips ſhall preſerve knowledge.* [f] *The Scribes and Phariſees ſit in* Moſes *Chair*, &c. To any Preacher of the Goſpel, to any Paſtor, or Doctor, for to every one of them Chriſt hath promiſed [g] *he will be with them alwaies even to the end of the World*: and of every one of them it is ſaid, [h] *He that heareth you heareth me*, &c. To any Biſhop or Prelate, for it is written, [i] *Obey your Prelates*, and again [k] *he hath given Paſtors and Doctors*, &c. *leſt we ſhould be carried about with every wind of Doctrine.* To any particular Church of Chriſtians, ſeeing it is a particular Church which is called [l] *The Houſe of God, a Pillar and ground of Truth*: and ſeeing of any particular Church it is written [m] *He that heareth not the Church let him be unto thee as a Heathen or a Publican.* We might refer it to any man that prays for Gods Spirit, for it is written, [n] *Every one that asketh receiveth*: and again, [o] *If any man want Wiſdom let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not.* Laſtly, we might refer it to the *Jews*, for without all doubt of them it is written, [p] *my Spirit that is in thee*, &c. All theſe means of agreement, whereof not any one but hath as much probability from Scripture,

[a] Prov. 16. 33.
[b] Prov. 16. 10.
[c] Prov. 21. 1.
[d] Mat. 18. 20.
[e] Mat. 2. 7.
[f] Mat. 25. 2.
[g] Mat. 28. 20.
[h] Luk. 10. 16.
[i] Heb. 13. 17.
[k] Eph. 4. 11.
[l] 1 Tim. 3. 15.
[m] Mat. 18. 17.
[n] Mat. 7. 8.
[o] Jam. 1. 5.
[p] Iſai. 59. 21.

pture, as that which you obtrude upon us, offer themſelves upon a ſudden to me: happily many more might be thought on, if we had time, but theſe are enough to ſhew, that would we make uſe of voluntary and deviſed means to determine differences, we had them in great abundance. And if you ſay theſe would fail us, and contradict themſelves; ſo, as we pretend, have yours. There have been *Popes* againſt *Popes*: Councils againſt Councils: Councils confirmed by *Popes*, againſt Councils confirmed by *Popes*: Laſtly, the Church of ſome Ages againſt the Church of other Ages.

9. Laſtly, whereas you find fault, *That* Proteſtants *upbraided with their diſcords, anſwer that they differ only in points not Fundamental*, I deſire you tell me whether they do ſo, or do not ſo; If they do ſo, I hope you will not find fault with the Anſwer: If you ſay they do not ſo, but in points Fundamental alſo; then they are not members of the ſame Church one with another, no more than with you: And therefore why ſhould you object to any of them, their differences from each other, any more than to your ſelves, their more and greater differences from you?

10. But *they are convinced ſometime even by their own confeſſions, that the Ancient Fathers taught divers points of Popery: and then they reply, thoſe Fathers may nevertheleſs be ſaved, becauſe thoſe Errors were not Fundamental.* And may not you alſo be convinced by the confeſſions of your own men, that the Fathers taught divers points held by *Proteſtants* againſt the Church of *Rome*, and divers againſt *Proteſtants* and the Church of *Rome*? Do not your Purging *Indexes*, clip the Tongues, and ſeal up the Lips of a great many for ſuch confeſſions? And is not the above cited confeſſion of your *Doway* Divines, plain and full to the ſame purpoſe? And do not you alſo, as freely as we, charge the Fathers with Errors, and yet ſay they were ſaved? Now what elſe do we underſtand by an *unfundamental* Error, but ſuch a one with which a man may poſſibly be ſaved? So that ſtill you proceed in condemning others for your own faults, and urging argu-

ments againſt us, which return more ſtrongly upon your ſelves.

11. But your will is, *we ſhould remember that Chriſt muſt alwaies have a viſible Church.* Anſw. Your pleaſure ſhall be obeyed, on condition you will not forget, that there is a difference between perpetual Viſibility, and perpetual Purity. As for the anſwer, which you make for us, true it is, we believe the *Catholick Church cannot periſh*, yet that ſhe may, and did Err in points not Fundamental; and that *Proteſtants* were obliged to forſake theſe Errors of the Church, as they did, though not the Churh for her Errors, for that they did not, but continued ſtill members of the Church. For it is not all one (though you perpetually confound them) *to forſake the Errors of the Church*, and to *forſake the Church*: or to *forſake the Church in her Errors*, and *ſimply to forſake the Church*: No more than it is for me to renounce my Brothers or my Friends Vices or Errors, and to renounce my Brother or my Friend. The former then was done by *Proteſtants*, the latter was not done. Nay not only not from the *Catholick*, but not ſo much as from the *Roman*, did they ſeparate *per omnia*, but only in thoſe practices which they conceived ſuperſtitious or impious. If you would at this time propoſe a form of Liturgy, which both Sides hold lawful, and then they would not joyn with you in this Liturgy, you might have ſome colour then to ſay, they renounce your communion abſolutely. But as things are now ordered, they cannot joyn with you in prayers, but they muſt partake with you in unlawful practices, and for this reaſon, they (*not abſolutely, but thus far*) ſeparate from your communion. And this, I ſay, they were obliged to do under pain of damnation. *Not as if it were damnable to hold an Error not damnable*, but becauſe it is damnable outwardly to profeſs and maintain it, and to joyn with others in the practice of it, when inwardly they did not hold it. Now had they continued in your communion, that they muſt have done, *vid.* have profeſſed to believe and externally practiſed your Errors, whereof they were

were convinced that they were Errors: which though the matters of the Errors had been not neceſſary, but only profitable, whether it had not been damnable diſſimulation and Hypocriſie, I leave it to you to Judge. You your ſelf tell us within two pages after this, *that you are obliged never to ſpeak any one leaſt lie againſt your knowledge*, §. 2. now what is this but to live in a perpetual lie?

12. As for that which in the next place you ſeem ſo to wonder at, That *both* Catholicks *and* Proteſtants, *according to the opinion of* Proteſtants, *may be ſaved in their ſeveral profeſſions, becauſe forſooth, we both agree in all Fundamental points*: I Anſwer, this propoſition ſo crudely ſet down, as you have here ſet it down, I know no *Proteſtant* will juſtifie. For you ſeem to make them teach, that it is an indifferent thing, for the attainment of Salvation, whether a man believe the Truth or the Falſhood; and that they care not in whether of theſe Religions a man live or die, ſo he die in either of them: whereas all that they ſay is this, That thoſe amongſt you which want means to find the Truth and ſo die in Error, or uſe the beſt means they can with induſtry, and without partiality to find the Truth, aad yet die in Error, theſe men, thus qualified, notwithſtanding theſe Errors may be ſaved. Secondly, for thoſe that have means to find the Truth, and will not uſe them, they conceive, though their caſe be dangerous, yet if they die with a general repentance for all their ſins, known and unknown, their Salvation is not deſperate. The Truths which they hold, of Faith in Chriſt, and Repentance, being as it were an Antidote againſt their Errors, and their negligence in ſeeking the Truth. Eſpecially ſeeing by confeſſion of both ſides we agree in much more than is ſimply, and indiſpenſably neceſſary to ſalvation.

13. *Obj. But ſeeing we make ſuch various uſe of this diſtinction, is it not prodigiouſly ſtrange that we will never be induced to give in a particular Catalogue what points be Fundamental?*

Anſw. And why I pray is it ſo *prodigiouſly ſtrange* that we give no anſwer to an unreaſonable demand? God himſelf hath told us, [a] *That where much is given, much ſhall be required; where little is given, little ſhall be required.* To Infants, Deaf-men, Mad-men, nothing for out we know, is given, and if it be ſo, of them *nothing* ſhall be required. Others perhaps may have means only given them to believe, [b] *That God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that ſeek him*; and to whom thus much only is given, to them it ſhall not be damnable, that they believe but only thus much. Which methinks is very manifeſt from the Apoſtle, in the *Epiſt. to the Heb.* where having firſt ſaid, *that without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*, he ſubjoyns as his reaſon, *for whoſoever cometh unto God, muſt believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that ſeek him.* Where in my opinion, this is plainly intimated, that this is the *minimum quod ſic*, the loweſt degree of Faith, wherewith, in men capable of Faith, God will be pleaſed: and that with this loweſt degree he will be pleaſed, where means of riſing higher are deficient. Beſides, if without this belief, *that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that ſeek him*, God will not be pleaſed, then his will is that we ſhould believe it. Now his will it cannot be, that we ſhould believe a falſhood: It muſt be therefore true, that he is a rewarder of them that ſeek him. Now it is poſſible that they which never heard of Chriſt, may ſeek God, therefore it is true that even they ſhall pleaſe him, and be rewarded by him; I ſay rewarded, not with bringing them immediately to Salvation without Chriſt, but with bringing them according to his good pleaſure, firſt, to Faith in Chriſt, and ſo to Salvation. To which belief the ſtory of *Cornelius* in the 10. *chap. of the Acts* of the Apoſtles, and S. *Peters* Words to him, are to me a great inducement. For firſt it is evident he believed not in Chriſt, but was a meer Gentile, and one that knew not but men might be worſhiped, and yet we are aſſured *that his Prayers and Alms* (even while he was in that ſtate) *came up for a memorial before God*; *That his Prayer was heard, and his Alms had in remembrance in the ſight of God.* v. 4. that upon this, *Then fearing God*

[a] Luk. 12. 48.

[b] Heb. 6. 11.

God and working righteouſneſs, (ſuch as it was) *he was accepted with God.* But how accepted? Not to be brought immediately to Salvation, but to be promoted to a higher degree of the knowledge of Gods will: For ſo it is in the 4. & 5. v. *Call for* Simon *whoſe ſirname is* Peter, *he ſhall tell thee what thou oughteſt to do,* and at the 33. verſ. *We are all here preſent before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God.* So that though even in his Gentiliſm, he was accepted in his preſent ſtate, yet if he had continued in it, and refuſed to believe in Chriſt after the ſufficient Revelation of the Goſpel to him, and Gods will to have him believe it, he that was accepted before, would not have continued accepted ſtill; for then that condemnation had come upon him, *than light was come unto him, and he loved Darkneſs more that Light.* So that (to proceed a ſtep farther) to whom Faith in Chriſt is ſufficiently propounded, as neceſſary to Salvation, to them it is ſimply neceſſary and Fundamental to believe in Chriſt, that is, to expect remiſſion of ſins, and Salvation from him, upon the performance of the conditions he requires; among which conditions one is, that we believe what he has revealed, when it is ſufficiently declared, to have been reveal-by him: For by doing ſo, *we ſet to our Seal, that God is true, and that Chriſt was ſent by him.* Now that may be ſufficiently declared to one (all things conſidered,) which, (all things conſidered) to another is not ſufficiently declared: and conſequently that may be Fundamental and neceſſary to one, which to another is not ſo. Which Variety of circumſtances, makes it impoſſible to ſet down an exact Catalogue of Fundamentals, and proves your requeſt as reaſonable, as if you ſhould deſire us (according to the Fable) to make a Coat to fit the Moon in all her changes; or to give you a Garment that will fit all ſtatures; Or to make you a Dyal to ſerve all Meridians; or to deſign particularly, what Proviſion will ſerve an Army for a Year: whereas there may be an Army of Ten Thouſand, there may be of 100000. And therefore without ſeting down a Catalogue of Fundamentals in particular (becauſe none that can be given, can Univerſally

ſerve

ſerve for all men, God requiring more of them to whom he gives more, and leſs of them to whom he gives leſs) we muſt content our ſelves by a general deſcription to tell you what is Fundamental. And to warrant us in doing ſo, we have your own example, §. 19. where being engaged to give us a Catalogue of Fundamentals, inſtead thereof you tell us only in general, *that all is Fundamental, and not to be disbelieved under pain of damnation, which the Church hath defined.* As you therefore think it enough to ſay in general, *that all is Fundamental which the Church has defined,* without ſetting down in particular a compleat Catalogue of all things, which in any Age the Church has defined (which I believe you will not undertake to do, and if you do, it will be contradicted by your Fellows:) So in reaſon you might think it enough for us alſo to ſay in general, *that it is ſufficient for any mans Salvation, to believe that the Scripture is true, and contains all things neceſſary for Salvation; and to do his beſt endeavour to find and believe the true ſenſe of it:* without delivering any particular Catalogue of the Fundamentals of Faith.

14. Neither *doth the want of ſuch a Catalogue* leave us in ſuch a *perplexed uncertainty* as you pretend. For though perhaps we cannot exactly diſtinguiſh in the Scripture, what *is revealed becauſe it is neceſſary,* from what is *neceſſary conſequently and accidentally, meerly becauſe it is revealed:* yet we are ſure enough, that all that is neceſſary any way is there, and therefore in believing all that is there, we are ſure to believe all that is neceſſary. And if we Err from the true and intended ſenſe of ſome, nay of many obſcure or ambiguous Texts of Scripture, yet we may be ſure enough, that we Err not damnably: becauſe, if we do indeed deſire and endeavour to find the Truth, we may be ſure we do ſo, and as ſure that it cannot conſiſt with the revealed goodneſs of God, to damn him for Error, that deſires and indeavours to find the Truth.

15. Ad §. 2.] The effect of this Paragraph (for as much as concerns us) is this, *that for any man to deny belief*

to

to any one thing be it great or ſmall known by him, to be revealed by Almighty God for a truth, is in effect to charge God with falſhood: for it is to ſay that God affirms that to be Truth, which he either knows to be not a Truth, or which he doth not know to be a Truth: and therefore without all Controverſie this is a damnable ſin. To this I ſubſcribe with Hand and Heart: adding withal, that not only he which knows, but he which believes (nay though it be erroneouſly) any thing to be revealed by God, and yet will not believe it, nor aſſent unto it, is in the ſame caſe, and commits the ſame ſin of derogation from Gods moſt perfect and pure Veracity.

16. Ad §. 3.] I ſaid purpoſely (*known by himſelf, and believes himſelf*) For as, without any diſparagement of a mans Honeſty, I may believe ſomething to be falſe, which he affirms, of his certain knowledge to be true, provided I neither know nor believe that he has ſo affirmed: So without any the leaſt diſhonour to Gods Eternal never failing Veracity, I may doubt of, or deny ſome truth revealed by him, if I neither know nor believe it to be revealed by him.

19. But *ignorance of what we are expreſly bound to know, is it ſelf a fault, and therefore cannot be an excuſe:* and therefore if you could ſhew the *Proteſtants* differ in thoſe points, the truth whereof (which can be but one) they were bound expreſly to know, I ſhould eaſily yield that one ſide muſt of neceſſity be in a mortal Crime. But for want of proof of this, you content your ſelf only to ſay it; and therefore I alſo might be contented only to deny it, yet I will not, but give a reaſon for my denial. And my reaſon is, becauſe our obligation expreſly to know any Divine Truth, muſt ariſe from Gods manifeſt revealing of it, and his revealing unto us that he has revealed it, and that his will is, we ſhould believe it: Now in the points controverted among *Proteſtants*, he hath not ſo dealt with us, therefore he hath not laid any ſuch obligation upon us. The major of this Syllogiſm is evident, and therefore I will not ſtand to prove it. The minor alſo will be evident to him that con-

conſiders, that in all the Controverſies of *Proteſtants*, there is a ſeeming conflict of Scripture with Scripture, Reaſon with Reaſon, Authority with Authority: which how it can conſiſt with the manifeſt revealing of the truth of either Side, I cannot well underſtand. Beſides, though we grant that Scripture, Reaſon and Authority, were all on one ſide, and the apparences of the other ſide all anſwerable: yet if we conſider the ſtrange power that education and prejudices inſtilled by it, have over even excellent underſtandings, we may well imagine, that many truths which in themſelves are revealed plainly enough, are yet to ſuch or ſuch a man, prepoſſeſt with contrary opinions, not revealed plainly. Neither doubt I but God, who knows whereof we are made, and what paſſions we are ſubject unto, will compaſſionate ſuch infirmities, and not enter into judgment with us for thoſe things, which, all things conſidered, were unavoidable.

20. Obj. *But till Fundamentals* (ſay you) *be ſufficiently propoſed* (*as revealed by God*) *it is not againſt Faith to reject them*; *or rather it is not poſſible prudently to believe them: And points unfundamental being thus ſufficiently propoſed as divine Truths, may not be denied*; *Therefore you conclude there is no difference between them: Anſw.* A Circumſtantial point, may by accident become Fundamental, becauſe it may be ſo propoſed that the denial of it, will draw after it the denial of this Fundamental truth, *that all which God ſays is true.* Notwithſtanding in themſelves there is a main difference between them: *Points Fundamental being thoſe only which are revealed by God, and commanded to be Preach'd to all, and believed by all. Points circumſtantial being ſuch, as though God hath revealed them, yet the Paſtors of the Church are not bound under pain of Damnation particularly to teach them unto all men every where, and the People may be ſecurely ignorant of them.*

21. *Obj.* You ſay, *Not Erring in points Fundamental, is not ſufficient for the preſervation of the Church*; *becauſe any Error maintained by it againſt Gods Revelation is deſtructive.* I anſwer. If you mean againſt Gods Revelation known by

by the Church to be ſo, it is true; but impoſſible that the Church ſhould do ſo, for *ipſo Facto* in doing it, it were a Church no longer. But if you mean againſt ſome Revelation, which the Church by error thinks to be no Revelation, it is falſe. The Church may ignorantly disbelieve ſuch a Revelation, and yet continue a Church; which thus I prove. That the Goſpel was to be preached to all Nations, was a Truth revealed before our Saviours Aſcenſion, in theſe words, *Go and teach all Nations. Mat.* 29. 19. Yet through prejudice or inadvertence, or ſome other cauſe, the Church disbelieved it, as it is apparent out of the 11. and 12. Chap. of the *Acts*, until the converſion of *Cornelius*, and yet was ſtill a Church. Therefore to disbelieve ſome divine Revelation, not knowing it to be ſo, is not deſtructive of ſalvation, or of the being of the Church. Again, It is a plain Revelation of God, that [a] the Sacrament of the Euchariſt *ſhould be adminiſtred in both kinds:* and [b] that the publick Hymns and *Prayers of the Church ſhould be in ſuch a language as is moſt for edification*; yet theſe Revelations the Church of *Rome* not ſeeing, by reaſon of the veil before their eyes, their Churches ſuppoſed infallibility, I hope the denial of them ſhall not be laid to their charge, no otherwiſe than as *building hay and ſtubble on the Foundations, not overthrowing the Foundation it ſelf.*

[a] 1 Cor. 11. 2[c].

[b] 1 Cor. 14, 15, 16. 26.

24. Ad §. 5. This Paragraph, if it be brought out of the Clouds, will I believe have in it theſe Propoſitions. 1. *Things are diſtinguiſhed by their different natures.* 2. *The Nature of Faith is taken, not from the matter believed, for then they that believed different matters ſhould have different Faiths, but from the Motive to it.* 3. *This Motive is Gods Revelation.* 4. *This Revelation is alike for all objects.* 5. *Proteſtants diſagree in things equally revealed by God: Therefore they forſake the formal motive of Faith: and therefore have no faith nor unity therein.* Which is truly a very proper and convenient argument to cloſe up a weak diſcourſe, wherein both the Propoſitions are falſe for matter, confuſed and diſordered for the form, and the concluſion utterly inconſequent. Firſt for the ſecond Propoſition, who knows not that the Eſſence of all Habits (and therefore of Faith

among the reſt) is taken from their Act, and their Object? If the Habit be general, from the Act and Object in general, if the Habit be ſpecial, from the Act and Object in ſpecial. Then for the motive to a thing, that it cannot be of the Eſſence of the thing to which it moves, who can doubt, that knows that a motive is an efficient cauſe: and that the efficient is always extrinſecal to the effect? For the fourth, that *Gods Revelation is alike for all Objects*, It is ambiguous: and if the ſenſe of it be, that his Revelation is an equal Motive to induce us to believe all objects revealed by him, it is true, but impertinent: If the ſenſe of it be, that all objects revealed by God are alike (that is, alike plainly and undoubtedly) revealed by him, it is pertinent, but moſt untrue. Witneſs the great diverſity of Texts of Scripture, whereof ſome are ſo plain and evident, that no man of ordinary ſenſe can miſtake the ſenſe of them. Some are ſo obſcure and ambiguous, that to ſay this or this is the certain ſenſe of them, were high preſumption. For the 5. *Proteſtants diſagree in things equally revealed by God!* In themſelves perhaps, but not equally to them: whoſe underſtandings by reaſon of their different Educations are faſhioned, and ſhaped for the entertainment of various Opinions, and conſequently ſome of them, more inclined to believe ſuch a ſenſe of Scripture, others to believe another; which to ſay that God will not take into his conſideration in judging mens Opinions, is to diſparage his goodneſs. But to what purpoſe is it, that theſe things are equally revealed to both, (as the light is equally revealed to all blind men,) if they be not fully revealed to either? The ſenſe of this Scripture, *Why are they then baptized for the dead?* and this, *He ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire*, and a thouſand others, is equally revealed to you and to another interpreter, that is certainly to neither. He now conceives one ſenſe of them, and you another; and would it not be an excellent inference, if I ſhould conclude now as you do; That you forſake the formal motive of Faith, which is Gods Revelation, and conſequently loſe all faith and unity therein? So likewiſe the *Jeſuits* and *Dominicans*, the *Franciſcans* and *Dominicans* diſagree about things equally

equally revealed by Almighty God: and ſeeing they do ſo, I beſeech you let me underſtand, why this reaſon will not exclude them as well as Proteſtants *from all faith and unity therein?* Thus you have failed of your undertaking in your firſt part of your Title, and that is a very ill *omen*, eſpecially in points of ſo ſtreight mutual dependance, that we ſhall have but ſlender performance in your ſecond aſſumpt. Which is, *That the Church is Infallible in all her Definitions, whether concerning points Fundamental, or not Fundamental.*

26. Ad §. 9. 10, 11. I grant that the Church *cannot without damnable ſin, either deny any thing to be true, which ſhe knows to be Gods truth:* or propoſe *any thing as his truth, which ſhe knows not to be ſo.* But that ſhe may not do this by ignorance or miſtake, and ſo without damnable ſin, that you ſhould have proved, but have not. But, ſay you *this excuſe cannot ſerve: for if the Church be aſſiſted only for points fundamental, ſhe cannot but know that ſhe may err in points not fundamental.* Anſ. It does not follow, unleſs you ſuppoſe, that the Church knows that ſhe is aſſiſted no farther. But if, being aſſiſted only ſo far, ſhe yet did conceive by error her aſſiſtance abſolute and unlimited, or if knowing her aſſiſtance reſtrained to fundamentals, ſhe yet conceived by error, that ſhe ſhould be guarded, from propoſing any thing but what was fundamental, then the conſequence is apparently falſe. *But at leaſt ſhe cannot be certain that ſhe cannot err, and therefore cannot be excuſed from headlong and pernicious temerity in propoſing points not fundamental, to be believed by Chriſtians as matters of Faith.* Anſ. Neither is this deſtruction worth any thing; unleſs it be underſtood of ſuch fundamental points, as ſhe is not warranted to propoſe by evident Text of Scripture. Indeed if ſhe propoſe ſuch, as *matters of Faith certainly true*, ſhe may well be queſtioned, *Quo Warranto?* She builds without a foundation, and *ſays thus ſaith the Lord, when the Lord doth not ſay ſo:* which cannot be excuſed from raſhneſs and high preſumption; ſuch a preſumption, as an Embaſſador ſhould commit, who ſhould ſay in his Maſters name that for which he hath no commiſſion. Of the ſame

nature, I ſay, but of a higher ſtrain: as much as the King of Heaven, is greater than any earthly King. But though ſhe may err in ſome points not fundamental, yet may ſhe have certainty enough in propoſing others; as for example, theſe, *That Abraham begat Iſaac*, that S. *Paul had a Cloak*, that *Timothy was ſick*; becauſe theſe, though not fundamental, *i. e.* no eſſential parts of Chriſtianity, yet are evidently, and undeniably ſet down in Scripture, and conſequently, may be without all raſhneſs propoſed by the Church as certain divine Revelations. Neither is your Argument concluding when you ſay, *If in ſuch things ſhe may be deceived, ſhe muſt be always uncertain of all ſuch things.* For my ſenſe may ſometimes poſſibly deceive me, yet I am certain enough that I ſee what I ſee, and feel what I feel. Our Judges are not infallible in their judgments, yet are they certain enough, that they judge aright, and that they proceed according to the evidence that is given, when they condemn a Thief, or a Murderer to the Gallows. A Traveller is not always certain of his way, but often miſtaken; and does it therefore follow that he can have no aſſurance that *Charing-Croſs* is his right way from the *Temple* to *White-Hall*? The ground of your error here, is your not diſtinguiſhing, between actual certainty and abſolute infallibillty. Geometricians are not infallible in their own Science: yet they are very certain of thoſe things, which they ſee demonſtrated. And Carpenters are not infallible, yet certain of the ſtraightneſs of thoſe things which agree with their Rule and Square. So though the Church be not infallibly certain, that in all her definitions, whereof ſome are about diſputable and ambiguous matters, ſhe ſhall proceed according to her Rule, yet being certain of the infallibility of her Rule, and that in this or that thing ſhe doth manifeſtly proceed according to it, ſhe may be certain of the Truth of ſome particular Decrees, and yet not certain that ſhe ſhall never decree but what is true.

27. Ad §. 12. Obj. *But if the Church may err in points not fundamental, ſhe may err in propoſing Scripture, and ſo we cannot be aſſured whether ſhe have not been deceived already.*

Anſ.

Anſ. The Church may err in her propoſition or cuſtody of the Canon of Scripture, if you underſtand by the Church, any preſent Church of one denomination, for example, the *Roman*, the *Greek*, or ſo. Yet have we ſufficient certainty of Scripture, not from the bare teſtimony of any preſent Church, but from Univerſal Tradition, of which the teſtimony of any preſent Church is but a little part. So that here you fall into the Fallacy, *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter.* For in effect this is the ſenſe of your Argument: Unleſs the Church be infallible, we can have no certainty of Scripture from the authority of the Church: Therefore unleſs the Church be infallible, we can have no certainty hereof at all. As if a man ſhould ſay; If the Vintage of *France* miſcarry, we can have no Wine from *France*: Therefore if that Vintage miſcarry we can have no Wine at all. And for the incorruption of Scripture, I know no other rational aſſurance we can have of it, than ſuch as we have of the incorruption of other ancient Books, that is, the conſent of ancient Copies: ſuch I mean *for the kind*, though it be far *greater for the degree of it.* And if the Spirit of God give any man any other aſſurance hereof, this is not rational and diſcurſive, but ſupernatural and infuſed. An aſſurance it may be to himſelf, but no argument to another. As for the Infallibility of the Church, it is ſo far from being a proof of the Scriptures incorruption, that no proof can be pretended for it, but incorrupted places of Scripture: which yet are as ſubject to corruption as any other, and more likely to have been corrupted (if it had been poſſible) than any other, and made to ſpeak as they do, for the advantage of thoſe men, whoſe ambition it hath been a long time, to bring all under their authority. Now then, if any man ſhould prove the Scriptures uncorrupted, becauſe the Church ſays ſo which is infallible: I would demand again touching this very thing, that there is an infallible Church, ſeeing it is not of it ſelf evident, how ſhall I be aſſured of it? And what can he anſwer, but that the Scripture ſays ſo in theſe and theſe places? Hereupon I would ask him, how ſhall I be aſſured, that the Scriptures

are

are incorrupted in thoſe places? ſeeing it is poſſible, and not altogether improbable, that theſe men, which deſire to be thought infallible, when they had the government of all things in their own hands, may have altered them for their purpoſe. If to this he anſwer again, that the Church is infallible, and therefore cannot do ſo. I hope it would be apparent, that he runs round in a circle, and proves the Scriptures incorruption, by the Churches infallibility, and the Churches infallibility by the Scriptures incorruption, and that is in effect the Churches infallibility, by the Churches infallibility, and the Scriptures incorruption by the Scriptures incorruption.

28. Now for your obſervation, that *ſome Books, which were not always known to be Canonical, have been afterwards received for ſuch. But never any book or ſyllable defined for Canonical, was afterwards queſtioned or rejected for Apocryphal:* I demand, touching the firſt ſort, whether they were commended to the Church by the Apoſtles as Canonical or not? If not, ſeeing the whole Faith was preached by the Apoſtles to the Church, and ſeeing after the Apoſtles, the Church pretends to no new Revelations, how can it be an Article of Faith to believe them Canonical? And how can you pretend, that your Church which makes this an Article of Faith, is ſo aſſiſted as not to propoſe any thing as a divine Truth which is not revealed by God? If they were, how then is the Church an infallible keeper of the Canon of Scripture, which hath ſuffered ſome Books of Canonical Scripture, to be loſt? and others to loſe for a long time their being Canonical, at leaſt, the neceſſity of being ſo eſteemed, and afterwards, as it were by the law of *Poſtliminium* hath reſtored their Authority and Canonicalneſs unto them? If this was delivered by the Apoſtles to the Church, the point was ſufficiently diſcuſſed, and therefore your Churches omiſſion to teach it for ſome ages, as an article of faith, nay degrading it from the number of articles of faith, and putting it among diſputable problems, was ſurely not very laudable. If it were not revealed by God to the Apoſtles, and by the Apoſtles to the Church, then can it be no Revelation, and therefore

fore her preſumption in propoſing it as ſuch, is inexcuſable.

29. And then for the other part of it, *that never any book or ſyllable defined for Canonical, was afterwards queſtioned or rejected for Apocryphal:* Certainly it is a bold aſſeveration, but extreamly falſe. For I demand; The Book of *Eccleſiaſticus* and *Wiſdom*, the *Epiſtle of* S. *James*, and *to the Hebrews*, were they by the Apoſtles approved for Canonical, or no? If not, with what face dare you approve them, and yet pretend that all your doctrin is Apoſtolical? Eſpecially ſeeing it is evident that this point is not deducible by rational diſcourſe from any other defined by them. If they were approved by them, this I hope was a ſufficient definition: and therefore you were beſt rub your forehead hard, and ſay, that theſe Books were never queſtioned. But if you do ſo, then I ſhall be bold to ask you, what Books you meant in ſaying before, *Some Books which were not always known to be Canonical, have been afterwards received?* Then for the Book of *Macchabes*, I hope you will ſay, it was defined for Canonical before S. *Gregories* time: and yet he, lib. 19. Moral, c. 13. citing a teſtimony out of it, prefaceth to it after this matter, *Concerning which matter we do not amiſs if we produce a teſtimony out of Books although not Canonical, yet ſet forth, for the edification of the Church. For Eleazar in the Book of Machabees*, &c. Which if it be not to reject it from being Canonical, is without queſtion, at leaſt to queſtion it. Moreover, becauſe you are ſo punctual, as to talk of words and ſyllables, I would know whether before *Sixtus Quintus* his time, your Church had a defined Canon of Scripture, or not? If not, then was your Church ſurely a moſt vigilant keeper of Scripture, that for 1500. years had not defined what was Scripture, and what was not. If it had, then I demand, was it *that*, ſet forth by *Sixtus*, or *that*, ſet forth by *Clement*, or a *third* different from both? If it were that ſet forth by *Sixtus*, then is it now condemned by *Clement*: if that of *Clement*, it was condemned I ſay, but ſure you will ſay contradicted and queſtioned by *Sixtus*; If different from both, then was it queſtioned and condemned by

by both, and ſtill lies under the condemnation. But then laſtly, ſuppoſe it had been true, *That both ſome Book not known to be Canonical had been received*, and that *never any after receiving had been queſtioned:* How had this been a ſign that the Church is infallibly aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt? In what mood or figure, would this concluſion follow out of theſe Premiſes? Certainly your flying to ſuch poor ſigns, as theſe are, is to me a great ſign, that you labour with penury of better arguments: and that, thus to catch at ſhadows and bulruſhes, is a ſhrewd ſign of a ſinking cauſe.

30. Ad §. 13. We are told here, *That the general promiſes of Infallibility to the Church, muſt not be reſtrained only to points fundamental: Becauſe then the Apoſtles words and writings may alſo be ſo reſtrained.*

Anſ. This alſo may be done, but if it be done, may eaſily be confuted. It is done to our hand in this very Paragraph, by five words taken out of Scripture, *All Scripture is divinely inſpired.* Shew but as much for the Church: Shew where it is written, *That all the decrees of the Church are divinely inſpired*; and the Controverſie will be at an end. Beſides, there is not the ſame reaſon for the Churches abſolute Infallibility, as for the Apoſtles and Scriptures. For if the Church fall into error, it may be reformed by comparing it with the rule of the Apoſtles doctrine and Scripture. But if the Apoſtles have erred in delivering the doctrine of Chriſtianity, to whom ſhall we have recourſe, for the diſcovering and correcting their error? Again, there is not ſo much ſtrength required in the Edifice as in the Foundation: and if but wiſe men have the ordering of the building, they will make it much a ſurer thing, that the foundation ſhall not fail the building, than that the building ſhall not fall from the foundation. And though the building be to be of Brick or Stone, and perhaps of Wood, yet if it may be poſſibly, they will have a Rock for their foundation, whoſe ſtability is a much more indubitable thing, than the adherence of the ſtructure to it. Now the Apoſtles and Prophets, and Canonical Writers, are the foundation of the Church, according to that of S. *Paul*,

built

built upon the foundation of Apoſtles and Prophets; therefore their ſtability, in reaſon ought to be greater than the Churches, which is built upon them. Again, a dependent Infallibility (eſpecially if the dependence be voluntary) cannot be ſo certain, as that on which it depends: But the Infallibility of the Church, depends upon the Infallibility of the Apoſtles, and the ſtreightneſs of the thing regulated, upon the ſtreightneſs of the Rule: and beſides this dependence is voluntary, for it is in the power of the Church to deviate from this Rule; being nothing elſe but an aggregation of men, of which every one has free will, and is ſubject to paſſions and error: Therefore the Churches infallibility, is not ſo certain as that of the Apoſtles.

31. Laſtly, *Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam?* If you be ſo infallible as the Apoſtles were, ſhew it as the Apoſtles did; *They went forth* (ſaith S. *Mark*) *and Preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming their words with Signs following.* It is impoſſible that God ſhould lie, and that the eternal Truth ſhould ſet his hand and ſeal to the confirmation of a falſhood, or of ſuch Doctrin as is partly true and partly falſe. The Apoſtles Doctrin was thus confirmed, therefore it was intirely true, and in no part either falſe or uncertain. I ſay in no part of that which they delivered conſtantly, as a certain divine Truth, and which had the Atteſtation of Divine Miracles. For that the Apoſtles themſelves, even after the ſending of the Holy Ghoſt, were, and through inadvertence or prejudice, continued for a time in an error, repugnant to a revealed Truth, it is as I have already noted unanſwerably evident, from the *ſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles.* For notwithſtanding our Saviours expreſs warrant and injunction, *to go and preach to all Nations,* yet until S. *Peter* was better informed by a viſion from Heaven, and by the converſion of *Cornelius*, both he and the reſt of the Church, held it unlawful for them, to go or preach the Goſpel to any but the Jews.

32. And for thoſe things which they profeſs to deliver as the dictates of human reaſon and prudence, and not as divine Revelations, why we ſhould take them to be divine

revelations, I ſee no reaſon; nor how we can do ſo, and not contradict the Apoſtles, and God himſelf. Therefore when S. *Paul* ſays, in the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinth.* 7. 12. *To the reſt ſpeak I, not the Lord*; And again, *concerning Virgins I have no commandment of the Lord, but I deliver my Judgment:* If we will pretend, that the Lord did certainly ſpeak, what S. *Paul* ſpake, and that his judgment was Gods commandment, ſhall we not plainly contradict S. *Paul*, and that ſpirit by which he wrote? which moved him to Write, as in other places divine Revelations, which he certainly knew to be ſuch, ſo in this place, his own judgment, touching ſome things which God had not particularly revealed unto him.

34. Obj. *But if the Apoſtles were Infallible, in all things propoſed by them as divine Truths, the like muſt be affirmed of the Church, becauſe* Proteſtants *teach the promiſe (of leading into all Truth) to be verified in the Church.*

Anſ. It's true that to the Apoſtles the promiſe was made, and to them only, yet the words are true alſo of the Church. But they agree to the Apoſtles *in a higher*, to the Church *in a lower* ſenſe: to the Apoſtles *in more abſolute*, to the Church in *a more limited* ſenſe. To the Apoſtles *abſolutely*, for the *Churches direction:* to the Church *Conditionally by adherence to that direction, and ſo far as ſhe doth adhere to it.* In a word, the Apoſtles were led into all Truths by the Spirit, *efficaciter:* The Church is led alſo into all Truth by the Apoſtles *writings*, *ſufficienter.* So that the Apoſtles and the Church, may be fitly compared to the Star and the Wiſemen. The Star was directed by the finger of God, and could not but go right to the place where Chriſt was: But the Wiſemen were led by the Star to Chriſt; led by it, I ſay, not *efficaciter*, or *irreſiſtibiliter*, but *ſufficienter*, ſo that if they would they might follow it, if they would not, they might chooſe. So was it between the Apoſtles writing Scriptures, and the Church. They in their writing were infallibly aſſiſted to propoſe nothing as a divine Truth, but what was ſo. The Church is alſo led into all Truth, but it is by the intervening of the Apoſtles writings: But it is as the Wiſemen were led by the Star,

Star, or as a Traveller is directed by a Mercurial Statue, or as a Pilot by his Card and Compaſs: led ſufficiently, but not irreſiſtibly: led ſo that ſhe may follow, not ſo that ſhe muſt. For ſeeing the Church is a ſociety of men, whereof every one (according to the Doctrine of the *Romiſh* Church) hath free-will in believing, it follows, that the whole aggregate has free-will in believing. And if any man ſay that at leaſt *it is morally impoſſible, that of ſo many whereof all may believe aright, not any ſhould do ſo:* I anſwer, It is true, if they did all give themſelves any liberty of judgment. But if all (as the caſe is here) captivate their underſtandings to one of them, all are as likely to err as that one. And he more likely to err than any other, becauſe he may err and thinks he cannot, and becauſe he conceives the Spirit abſolutely promiſed to the ſucceſſion of Biſhops, of which many have been notoriouſly and confeſſedly wicked men, *Men of the World:* whereas this Spirit is the *Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, becauſe he ſeeth him not, neither knoweth him.*

38. Ad §. 16. To this Paragraph, which pretends to ſhew, *that if the Catholick Church be fallible in ſome points, it follows, that no true Proteſtant can with aſſurance believe the Univerſal Church in any one point of Doctrin.*

I *Anſwer.* Though the Church being not Infallible, I cannot believe her in every thing ſhe ſays, yet I can and muſt believe her in every thing ſhe proves, either by Scripture, Reaſon, or Univerſal Tradition, be it Fundamental, or be it not Fundamental. This you ſay, we *cannot, in points not Fundamental, becauſe in ſuch we believe ſhe may err.* But this I know, we can: becauſe though ſhe may err in ſome things, yet ſhe does not err in what ſhe proves, though it be not Fundamental. Again you ſay, *we cannot do it in Fundamentals, becauſe we muſt know what points be Fundamental, before we go to learn of her.* Not ſo, but I muſt learn of the Church, or of ſome part of the Church, or I cannot know any thing Fundamental or not Fundamental. For how can I come to know, that there was ſuch a Man as Chriſt, that he taught ſuch

Doctrin, that he and his Apoſtles did ſuch miracles in confirmation of it, that the Scripture is Gods Word, unleſs I be taught it. So then the Church is, though *not a certain Foundation and proof of my Faith, yet a neceſſary introduction to it.*

39. But the *Churches infallible direction, extending only to Fundamentals, unleſs I know them before I go to learn of her, I may be rather deluded than inſtructed by her.* The reaſon and connexion of this conſequence, I fear neither I nor you do well underſtand. And beſides I muſt tell you, you are too bold in taking that which no man grants you, *that the Church is an infallible directer in Fundamentals.* For if ſhe were ſo, then muſt we not only learn Fundamentals of her, but alſo *learn of her what is fundamental, and take all for fundamental which ſhe delivers to be ſuch.* In the performance whereof, if I knew any one Church to be infallible, I would quickly be of that Church. But good Sir, you muſt needs do us this favor, to be ſo acute, as to diſtinguiſh between, being *infallible in fundamentals*, and being an *infallible guide in fundamentals.* That there ſhall be always *a Church infallible in fundamentals*, we eaſily grant; for it comes to no more but this, *that there ſhall be always a Church.* But that there ſhall be always ſuch a Church, which is an infallible Guide in fundamentals, this we deny. For this cannot be without ſetling a known infallibility in ſome one known ſociety of Chriſtians, (as the *Greek* or the *Roman*, or ſome other Church) by adhering to which Guide, men might be guided to believe aright in all Fundamentals. A man that were deſtitute of all means of communicating his thoughts to others, might yet in himſelf, and to himſelf be infallible, but he could not be a Guide to others. A man or a Church that were inviſible, ſo that none could know how to repair to it for direction, could not be an infallible guide, and yet he might be in himſelf infallible. You ſee then there is a wide difference between theſe two, and therefore I muſt beſeech you not to confound them, nor to take the one for the other.

40. But they that *know what points are Fundamental, otherwiſe than by the Churches authority, learn not of the Church:* Yes,

Yes, they may learn of the Church, that the Scripture is the word of God, and from the Scripture, that ſuch points are fundamental, others are not ſo; and conſequently learn, even of the Church, even of your Church, that all is not fundamental, nay all is not true, which the Church teacheth to be ſo. Neither do I ſee what hinders, but a man may learn of a Church, how to confute the Errors of that Church which taught him: as well as of my Maſter in Phyſick, or the Mathematicks, I may learn thoſe rules and principles, by which I may confute my Maſters erroneous concluſions.

41. But you ask, *If the Church be not an infallible teacher, why are we commanded to hear, to ſeek, to obey the Church?* I Anſwer. For commands *to ſeek the Church*, I have not yet met with any, and I believe you, if you were to ſhew them, would be your ſelf to ſeek. But yet if you could produce ſome ſuch, we might ſeek the Church to many good purpoſes, without ſuppoſing her *a Guide infallible.* And then for *hearing and obeying the Church*, I would fain know, whether none may be heard and obeyed, but thoſe that are infallible? Whether particular Churches, Governors, Paſtors, Parents, be not to be heard and obeyed? Or whether all theſe be Infallible? I wonder you will thruſt upon us ſo often, theſe worn-out Objections, without taking notice of their Anſwers.

42. Your Argument from S. *Auſtine's* firſt place, is a fallacy, *A dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter.* If the *whole Church practiſe any of theſe things (matters of order and decency,* for ſuch only there he ſpeaks of,*) to diſpute whether that ought to be done, is inſolent madneſs.* And from hence you infer, *If the whole Church practiſe any thing, to diſpute whether it ought to be done, is inſolent madneſs.* As if there were no difference between *any thing, and any of theſe things?* Or as if I might not eſteem it pride and folly, to contradict and diſturb the Church for matter of order, pertaining to the time and place, and other circumſtances of Gods worſhip; and yet account it neither pride nor folly, to go about to reform ſome errors, which the Church hath ſuffered to come in, and to vitiate the very

ſubſtance

ſubſtance of Gods worſhip. It was a practice of the whole Church in Saint *Auſtines* time, and eſteemed an Apoſtolick Tradition, even by Saint *Auſtine* himſelf, *That the Euchariſt ſhould be adminiſtred to Infants:* Tell me Sir, I beſeech you; Had it been inſolent madneſs to diſpute againſt this practice, or had it not? If it had, how inſolent and mad are you, that have not only diſputed againſt it, but utterly aboliſhed it? If it had not, then as I ſay, you muſt underſtand Saint *Auſtines* words, not ſimply of all things, but (as indeed he himſelf reſtrained them) *of theſe things, of matter of Order, Decency, and Uniformity.*

44. Obj. But the Doctrines, that *Infants are to be baptized, and thoſe that are baptized by Hereticks, are not to be rebaptized, are neither of them to be proved by Scripture: And yet according to* S. *Auſtine they are true Doctrins, and we may be certain of them upon the Authority of the Church, which we could not be, unleſs the Church were Infallible; therefore the Church is Infallible.* I anſwer, that there is no repugnance but we may be certain enough, of the Univerſal Traditions of the ancient Church, ſuch as in S. *Auſtin*'s account, theſe were which here are ſpoken of, and yet not be certain enough, of the definitions of the preſent Church. Unleſs you can ſhew (which I am ſure you can never do) that the Infallibility of the preſent Church, was always a Tradition of the ancient Church. Now your main buſineſs is to prove the preſent Church Infallible, not ſo much in conſigning ancient Traditions, as in defining emergent controverſies. Again, it follows not, becauſe the Churches Authority, is warrant enough for us to believe ſome Doctrin, touching which the Scripture is ſilent, therefore it is Warrant enough to believe theſe, to which the Scripture ſeems repugnant. Now the Doctrins which S. *Auſtin* received upon the Churches Authority, were of the firſt ſort; the Doctrins for which we deny your Churches Infallibility are of the ſecond. And therefore though the Churches Authority, might be ſtrong enough, to bear the weight which S. *Auſtin* laid upon it, yet happily it may not be ſtrong enough, to bear that which

which you lay upon it. Though it may ſupport ſome Doctrines without Scripture, yet ſurely not againſt it. And laſt of all, to deal ingeniouſly with you and the world, I am not ſuch an Idolater of S. *Auſtin*, as to think a thing proved ſufficiently becauſe he ſays it, nor that all his ſentences are Oracles; and particularly in this thing, that whatſoever was practiſed or held by the Univerſal Church of his time, muſt needs have come from the Apoſtles. Though conſidering the nearneſs of his time to the Apoſtles, I think it a good probable way, and therefore am apt enough to follow it, when I ſee no reaſon to the contrary. Yet I profeſs I muſt have better ſatisfaction, before I can induce my ſelf to hold it certain and infallible. And this, not becauſe *Popery* would come in at this door, as ſome have vainly feared, but becauſe by the Church Univerſal of ſome time, and the Church Univerſal of other times, I ſee plain contradictions held and practiſed. Both which could not come from the Apoſtles, for then the Apoſtles had been teachers of falſehood. And therefore the belief or practice of the preſent Univerſal Church, can be no infallible proof, that the Doctrin ſo believed, or the cuſtom ſo practiſed came from the Apoſtles. I inſtance in the Doctrine of the *Millenaries*, and the *Euchariſts neceſſity for Infants*: both which Doctrines have been taught by the conſent of the eminent Fathers of ſome ages, without any oppoſition from any of their Contemporaries: and were delivered by them, not as Doctors, but as Witneſſes, not as their own Opinions, but as Apoſtolick Traditions. And therefore meaſuring the Doctrin of the Church by all the Rules which Cardinal *Perron* gives us for that purpoſe, both theſe Doctrines muſt be acknowledged to have been the Doctrines of the Ancient Church of ſome age, or ages; And that the contrary Doctrines were Catholick at ſome other time, I believe you will not think it needful for me to prove. So that either I muſt ſay, the Apoſtles were fountains of contradictious Doctrines, or that being the Univerſal Doctrine of the preſent Church, is no ſufficient proof that it came originally from the Apoſtles. Beſides,

ſides, who can warrant us, that the Univerſal Traditions of the Church were all Apoſtolical? ſeeing in that famous place for Traditions, in *Tertullian*, [a] *Quicunque traditor*, any Author whatſoever is founder good enough for them. And who can ſecure us, that Humane inventions, and ſuch as came *à quocunque Traditore*, might not in a ſhort time, gain the reputation of Apoſtolick! Seeing the direction then was, [b] *Precepta majorum Apoſtolicas Traditiones quiſque exiſtimat.*

[a] *De Corona Militis*, c. 3. & 4. Where having recounted ſundry unwritten Traditions then obſerved by Chriſtians, many whereof, by the way, (notwithſtanding the Council of *Trents* profeſſion, *to receive them and the written Word with the like affection of Piety*) are now rejected and neglected by the Church of *Rome*: For example *Immerſion in Baptiſm*; *Taſting a mixture of Milk and Honey preſently after*; *Abſtaining from Bathes for a week after*; *Accounting it an impiety to pray kneeling on the Lords day, or between Eaſter and Pentecoſt*: I ſay, having reckoned up theſe and other Traditions in the 3. *chap.* He adds another in the fourth, of *the Veiling of Women*; And then adds, *Since I find no law for this, it follows that Tradition muſt have given this obſervation to cuſtom, which ſhall gain in time, Apoſtolick authority by the interpretation of the reaſon of it. By theſe examples therefore it is declared, that the obſerving of unwritten Tradition, being confirmed by cuſtom, may be defended. The perſeverance of the obſervation being a good teſtimony of the goodneſs of the Tradition. Now cuſtom even in civil affairs where a law is wanting, paſſes for a law. Neither is it material whether it be grounded on Scripture, or reaſon; ſeeing reaſon is commendation enough for a law. Moreover if law be grounded on reaſon, all that muſt be law, which is ſo grounded.*—A quocunque productum——*Whoſoever is the producer of it. Do ye think it is not lawful*, Omni fideli, *for every faithful man to conceive and conſtitute? Provided he conſtitute only what is not repugnant to Gods will, what is conducible for diſcipline and available to ſalvation? ſeeing the Lord ſays, why even of our ſelves, judge ye not what is right? And a little after, This reaſon now demand, ſaving the reſpect of the* Tradition,—— A quocunque Traditore cenſetur, nec auctorem reſpiciens ſed Auctoritatem; *From whatſoever Tradtor it comes; neither regard the Author but the Authority.* [b] Hier.

46. But let us ſee what S. *Chryſoſtom* ſays, *They (the Apoſtles) delivered not all things in writing* (who denies it?) *but many things alſo without writing*, (who doubts of it?) *and theſe alſo are worthy of belief.* Yes, if we knew what they were. But many things are worthy of belief, which are not neceſſary to be believed: As that *Julius Cæſar* was Emperor of *Rome* is a thing worthy of belief, being ſo well teſtified as it is, but yet it is not neceſſary to be believed; a man may be ſaved without it. Thoſe many works which *our Saviour did* (*which S.* John *ſuppoſes, would not have*

have been contained in a World of Books) if they had been written, or if God by ſome other means had preſerved the knowledge of them, had been as worthy to be believed, and as neceſſary as thoſe that are written. But to ſhew you how much a more faithful keeper Records are than report, thoſe few that were written are preſerved and believed, thoſe infinity more that were not written, are all loſt and vaniſhed out of the memory of men. And ſeeing God in his providence, hath not thought fit to preſerve the memory of them, he hath freed us from the obligation of believing them: for every obligation ceaſes, when it becomes impoſſible. Who can doubt but the Primitive Chriſtians, to whom the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles were written, either of themſelves underſtood, or were inſtructed by the Apoſtles, touching the ſenſe of the obſcure places of them? Theſe Traditive interpretations, had they been written and diſperſed, as the Scriptures were, had without queſtion been preſerved, as the Scriptures are. But to ſhew how excellent a Keeper of the Tradition, the Church of *Rome* hath been, or even the Catholick Church, for want of writing they are all loſt, nay were all loſt, within a few Ages after Chriſt. So that if we conſult the Ancient Interpreters, we ſhall hardly find any two of them agree about the ſenſe of any one of them. *Cardinal Perron*, in his diſcourſe of Traditions, having alledged this place for them, *Hold the Traditions*, &c. tell us we *muſt not anſwer, that S.* Paul *ſpeaks here, only of ſuch Traditions, which (though not in this Epiſt. to the* Theſſalonians) *yet were afterwards written, and in other Books of Scripture: becauſe it is upon occaſion of Tradition* (touching the *cauſe* of the *hinderance of the coming of* Antichriſt,) *which was never written, that he lays this injunction upon them, to hold the Traditions.* Well, let us grant this Argument good, and concluding; and that the Church of the *Theſſalonians*, or the Catholick Church (for what S. *Paul* writ to one Church he writ to all,) were to hold ſome unwritten Traditions, and among the reſt, what was the cauſe of the hinderance of the coming of *Antichriſt*. But what if they did not perform

their duty in this point, but ſuffered this Tradition to be loſt out of the memory of the Church? Shall we not conclude, that ſeeing God would not ſuffer any thing neceſſary to Salvation to be loſt, and he has ſuffered this Tradition to be loſt, therefore the knowledge or belief of it, though it were a profitable thing, yet it was not neceſſary? I hope you will not challenge ſuch authority over us, as to oblige us to impoſſibilities, to do that which you cannot do your ſelves. It is therefore requiſite that you make this command poſſible to be obeyed, before you require obedience unto it. Are you able then to inſtruct us ſo well, as to be fit to ſay unto us, *Now ye know what withholdeth?* Or do you your ſelves know that ye may inſtruct us? Can ye, or dare you ſay, this or this was this hindrance which S. *Paul* here meant, and all men under pain of damnation are to believe it? Or if you cannot, (as I am certain you cannot) go then, and Vaunt your Church, for the only Watchful, Faithful, Infallible Keeper of the Apoſtles Traditions; when here this very Tradition, which here in particular was depoſited with the *Theſſalonians* and the Premitive Church, you have utterly loſt it, ſo that there is no Footſtep or print of it remaining, which with Divine Faith we may rely upon. Bleſſed therefore be the goodneſs of God, who ſeeing that what was not written, was in ſuch danger to be loſt, took order, that what was neceſſary ſhould be written! S. *Chryſoſtoms* counſel therefore, of *accounting the Churches Traditions worthy of belief*, we are willing to obey: And if you can of any thing make it appear, that *it is Tradition*, we will ſeek no farther. But this we ſay withal, that we are perſuaded we cannot make this appear in any thing, but *only the Canon of Scripture*, and that there is nothing now extant, and to be known by us, which can put in ſo good Plea, to be the unwritten Word of God, as the unqueſtioned Books of Canonical Scripture, to be the written Word of God.

47. You conclude this Paragraph with a ſentence of S. *Auſtin*'s who ſays, *The Church doth not approve, nor diſſemble, nor do theſe things which are againſt Faith*

or

or good Life: and from hence you conclude, *that it never hath done ſo, nor never can do ſo.* But though the argument hold in Logick *à non poſſe, ad non eſſe,* yet I never heard, that it would hold back again, *à non eße, ad non poſſe.* The Church cannot do this, therefore it does it not, follows with good conſequence: but the Church does not this, therefore it ſhall never do it, nor can never do it, this I believe will hardly follow. In the Epiſtle next before to the ſame *Januarius*, writing of the ſame matter, he hath theſe words, *It remains that the thing you inquire of, muſt be of that third kind of things, which are different in divers places. Let every one therefore do, that which he finds done in the Church to which he comes, for none of them is againſt Faith or good manners.* And why do you not infer from hence, that *no particular Church can bring up any Cuſtom that is againſt Faith or good manners?* Certainly this conſequence has as good reaſon for it as the former. If a man ſay of the Church of *England*, (what S. *Auſtin* of the Church) that ſhe neither approves, nor diſſembles, nor does any thing againſt Faith or good manners, would you collect preſently, that this man did either make or think the Church of *England* infallible? Furthermore, it is obſervable out of this, and the former Epiſtle, that this Church *which did not* (as S. *Auſtin* according to you, thought) *approve or diſſemble, or do any thing againſt Faith or good Life*, did yet tolerate and diſſemble vain ſuperſtitions, and humane preſumptions, and ſuffer all places to be full of them, and to be exacted, as, nay more ſeverely than the commandments of God himſelf. This S. *Auſtin* himſelf profeſſeth in this very Epiſtle. *This* (ſaith he) *I do infinitely grieve at, that many moſt wholeſom precepts of the Divine Scripture, are little regarded; and in the mean time, all is ſo full of ſo many preſumptions, that he is more grievouſly found fault with, who during his octaves, toucheth the Earth with his naked Foot, than he that ſhall bury his Soul in Drunkenneſs.* Of theſe he ſays, *that they were neither contained in Scripture, decreed by Councils, nor corroborated by the Cuſtom of the Univerſal Church.* And *though not againſt Faith, yet unprofitable burdens of Chriſtian Liberty, which*

made the condition of the Jews *more tolerable than that of Chriſtians.* And therefore he profeſſes of them, *Approbare non poſſum, I cannot approve them.* And *ubi facultas tribuitur, reſecanda exiſtimo, I think they are to be cut off, whereſoever we have power.* Yet ſo deeply were they rooted, and ſpread ſo far, through the indiſcreet devotion of the People, always more prone to ſuperſtion than true Piety, and through the connivence of the Governors, who ſhould have ſtrangled them at their Birth, that himſelf, though he grieved at them, and could not allow them, yet for fear of offence he durſt not ſpeak againſt them, *multa hujuſmodi propter nonnullarum vel ſanctarum vel turbulentarum perſonarum ſcandala devitanda liberius improbare non audeo. Many of theſe things for fear of ſcandalizing many holy perſons, or provoking thoſe that are turbulent, I dare not freely diſallow.* Nay, the Catholick Church it ſelf, did ſee and diſſemble, and tolerate them; for theſe are the things of which he preſently ſays after, *the Church of God* (and you will have him ſpeak of the true Catholick Church) *placed between Chaffe and Tares, tolerates many things.* Which was directly againſt the command of the Holy Spirit, given the Church by S. *Paul*; *To ſtand faſt in that liberty wherewith Chriſt hath made her free, and not to ſuffer her ſelf to be brought in bondage to theſe ſervile burdens.* Our Saviour tells the Scribes and Phariſees, *that in vain they Worſhiped God, teaching for Doctrines mens Commandments: For that laying aſide the Commandments of God, they held the Traditions of men, as the waſhing of Pots, and Cups, and many other ſuch like things.* Certainly that which S. *Auſtin* complains of, as the general fault of Chriſtians of his time, was parallel to this: *Multa* (ſaith he) *quæ in divinis libris ſaluberrima præcepta ſunt, minus curantur*; This I ſuppoſe I may very well render in our Saviours Words, *The commandments of God are laid aſide*; and then; *tam multis preſumptionibus ſic plena ſunt omnia, all things, or all places, are ſo full of ſo many preſumptions, and thoſe exacted with ſuch ſeverity, nay with Tyranny, that he was more ſeverely cenſured, who in the time of his Octaves touched the Earth with his naked Feet, than he which drown-*

ed

ed and buried his Soul in Drink. Certainly, if this be not *to teach for Doctrines mens Commandments*, I know not what is. And therefore theſe ſuperſtitious Chriſtians might be ſaid, *to Worſhip God in vain*, as well as Scribes and Phariſees. And yet great variety of ſuperſtitions of this kind, were then already ſpread over the Church, being different in divers place. This is plain from theſe Words of S. *Auſtin* of them, *diverſorum locorum diverſis moribus innumerabiliter variantur*; and apparent, becauſe the ſtream of them was grown ſo violent, that he durſt not oppoſe it, *liberiùs improbare non audeo, I dare not freely ſpeak againſt them.* So that to ſay, tha Catholick Church tolerated all this, and for fear of offence, durſt not abrogate or condemn it, is to ſay (if we Judge rightly of it) that the Church with ſilence and connivence generally tolerated Chriſtians to *worſhip God in vain.* Now how this tolerating of Univerſal ſuperſtition in the Church, can conſiſt with the aſſiſtance and direction of Gods omnipotent ſpirit to guard it from ſuperſtition, and with the accompliſhment of that pretended Propheſie of the Church, I *have ſet Watchmen upon thy Walls, O* Jeruſalem, *which ſhall never hold their peace Day nor Night*; beſides how theſe ſuperſtitions being thus nouriſhed, cheriſhed, and ſtrengthned by the practice of the moſt, and urged with great violence upon others as the commandments of God, and but fearfully oppoſed or contradicted by any, might in time take ſuch deep Root, and ſpread their Branches ſo far, as to paſs for Univerſal Cuſtoms of the Church, he that does not ſee, ſees nothing. Eſpecially, conſidering the catching and contagious nature of this ſin, and how faſt ill Weeds ſpread, and how true and experimented that rule is of the Hiſtorian, *Exempla non conſiſtunt ubi incipiunt, ſed quamlibet in tenuem recepta tramitem latiſſimè evagandi ſibi faciunt poteſtatem.* Examples do not ſtay where they begin, but tho at firſt pent up in a narrow Tract, they make themſelves room for extravagant wandrings. Nay that ſome ſuch ſuperſtition had not already even in S. *Auſtins* time, prevailed ſo far, as to be *Conſuetudine univerſæ Eccleſiæ roboratum*, confirmed by the Cuſtom

Cuſtom of the Univerſal Church, who can doubt that conſiders, that the practice of *Communicating Infants*, had even then got the credit, and authority, not only of an Univerſal Cuſtom, but alſo of an Apoſtolick Tradition.

49. But now after all this ado, what if S. *Auſtin* ſays not this which is pretended of the Church, *viz. That ſhe neither approves, nor diſſembles, nor practiſes any thing againſt Faith or good Life*, but only of good men in the Church? Certainly, though ſome Copies read as you would have it, yet you ſhould not have diſſembled, that others read the place otherwiſe, *vix. Eccleſia multa tolerat, & tamen, quæ ſunt contra Fidem & bonam vitam, nec bonus approbat*, &c. *The Church tolerates many things; and yet what is againſt Faith or good Life, a good man will neither approve, nor diſſemble, nor practiſe.*

50. Ad §. 17. *That* Abraham *begat Iſaacc*, is a point very far from being Fundamental; and yet I hope you will grant, that *Proteſtants* believing Scripture to be the Word of God, may be certain enough of the truth and certainty of it. For what if they ſay *that the Catholick Church, and much more themſelves may poſſibly Err in ſome unfundamental points*, it is therefore conſequent, they can be certain of none ſuch? What if a wiſer man than I may miſtake the ſenſe of ſome obſcure place of *Ariſtotle*, may I not therefore without any arrogance or inconſequence, conceive my ſelf certain that I underſtand him in ſome plain places, which carry their ſenſe before them? And then for points Fundamental, to what purpoſe do you ſay, *That we muſt firſt know what they be, before we can be aſſured that we cannot Err in underſtanding the Scripture*; when we pretend not at all to any aſſurance that we cannot Err, but only to a ſufficient certainty, that we do not Err, but rightly underſtand thoſe things that are plain, whether Fundamental or not Fundamental? That *God is, and is a rewarder of them that ſeek him*: That *there is no Salvation but by Faith in Chriſt*: That by *repentance and Faith in Chriſt Remiſſion of ſins may be obtained*: That *there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the Body*: Theſe we conceive both

true,

true, becauſe the Scripture ſays ſo, and Truths Fundamental, becauſe they are neceſſary parts of the Goſpel, whereof our Saviour ſaies, *Qui non crediderit, damnabitur.* All which we either learn from Scripture immediately, or learn of thoſe that learn it of Scripture, ſo that neither Learned nor Unlearned pretend to know theſe things independently of Scripture. And therefore in imputing this to us, you cannot excuſe your ſelf from having done us a palpable injury.

52. Ad §. 19.] To that which is here urged of the differences amongſt *Proteſtants* concerning many points: I anſwer, that thoſe differences between *Proteſtants* concerning Errors damnable and not damnable, Truths Fundamental and not Fundamental, may be eaſily reconciled. For either the Error they ſpeak of *may be purely and ſimply involuntary*, or it may be in reſpect of the *cauſe of it voluntary*. If the cauſe of it be ſome voluntary and avoidable fault, the Error is it ſelf ſinful, and conſequently in its own nature damnable; As if by negligence in ſeeking the Truth, by unwillingneſs to find it, by Pride, by obſtinacy, by deſiring that Religion ſhould be true which ſutes beſt with my ends, by fear of mens ill opinion, or any other worldly fear, or any other worldly hope, I betray my ſelf to any Error contrary to any Divine revealed Truth, that Error may be juſtly ſtiled a ſin, and conſequently of it ſelf to ſuch a one damnable. But if I be guilty of none of theſe faults, but be deſirous to know the Truth, and diligent in ſeeking it, and adviſe not at all with Fleſh and Blood about the choice of my opinions, but only with God, and that Reaſon that he hath given me, if I be thus qualified, and yet through human infirmity fall into Error, that Error cannot be damnable. Again, the party erring may be conceived either to die with contrition for all his ſins known and unknown, or without it; If he die without it, this Error in it ſelf damnable, will be likewiſe ſo unto him: If he die with contrition (as his Error can be no impediment but he may) his Error though in it ſelf damnable, to him according to your Doctrine, will not prove ſo. And therefore ſome

of

of those Authors whom you quote, speaking of Errors whereunto men were betrayed, or wherein they were kept by their Fault, or Vice, or Passion (as for the most part men are:) Others speaking of them, as Errors simply and purely involuntary, and the effects of human infirmity; some as they were *retracted by Contrition* (to use your own phrase) others, as they were not; no marvel though they have past upon them, some a heavier, and some a milder, some an absolving, and some a condemning sentence. The least of all these Errors, which here you mention, having malice enough too frequently mixed with it, to sink a man deep enough into Hell: and the greatest of them all, being according to your Principles, either no fault at all, or very Venial, where there is no malice of the will conjoyned with it. And if it be, yet as the most malignant poyson, will not poyson him that receives with it a more powerful Antidote: so I am confident your own Doctrine will force you to confess, that whosoever dies with Faith in Christ, and Contrition for all sins known and unknown (in which heap all his sinful Errors must be comprized,) can no more be hurt by any the most malignant and pestilent Error, than S. *Paul* by the Viper which he shook off into the fire. Now touching the *necessity of Repentance from Dead works, and Faith in Christ Jesus the Son of God, and Saviour of the World*, they all agree; and therefore you cannot deny, but they agree about all that is simply necessary. Moreover, though, if they should go about to choose out of Scripture all these Propositions and Doctrines which integrate and make up the Body of Christian Religion, peradventure there would not be so exact agreement amongst them, as some say there was between the 70. Interpreters, in Translating the *Old Testament*; yet thus far without Controversie they do all agree, that in the Bible all these things are contained, and therefore, that whosoever does truly and sincerely believe the Scripture, must of necessity either in *Hypothesi*, or at least *in thesi*, either *formally*, or at least *virtually*, either *explicitely*, or at least *implicitely*, either in *Act* or at least in *preparation of mind*, believe all

all things Fundamental: It being not Fundamental, nor required of Almighty God, to believe the true ſenſe of Scripture in all places, but only that we ſhould endeavour to do ſo, and be prepared in mind to do ſo, whenſoever it ſhall be ſufficiently propounded to us. Suppoſe a man in ſome diſeaſe were preſcribed a Medicine conſiſting of twenty ingredients, and he adviſing with Phyſitians, ſhould find them differing in Opinion about it, ſome of them telling him, that all the ingredients were abſolutely neceſſary; ſome, that only ſome of them were neceſſary, the reſt only profitable, and requiſite *ad melius eſſe*, laſtly ſome, that ſome only were neceſſary, ſome profitable, and the reſt ſuperfluous, yet not hurtful; Yet all with one accord agreeing in this, That the *whole receipt had in it all things neceſſary* for the recovery of his health, and that if he made uſe of it, he ſhould infallibly find it ſucceſsful: what wiſe man would not think they agreed ſufficiently for his direction to the recovery of his health? Juſt ſo, theſe *Proteſtant* Doctors, with whoſe diſcords you make ſuch Tragedies, agreeing in *Theſi* thus far, that the *Scripture evidently contains all things neceſſary to Salvation*, both for matter of Faith and of practice, and that whoſoever believes it, and endeavours to find the true ſenſe of it, and to conform his Life unto it, ſhall certainly perform all things neceſſary to Salvation, and undoubtedly be ſaved; agreeing I ſay thus far, what matters it for the direction of men to Salvation, though they differ in opinion, touching what points are abſolutely neceſſary, and what not? What Errors abſolutely repugnant to Salvation, and what not? Eſpecially conſidering that although they differ about the Queſtion of the neceſſity of theſe Truths, yet for the moſt part they agree in this that Truths they are, and profitable at leaſt, though not ſimply neceſſary. And though they differ in the Queſtion, whether the contrary Errors be deſtructive of Salvation, or no, yet in this they conſent, that Errors they are, and hurtful to Religion, though not deſtructive of Salvation. Now that which God requires of us is this; That we ſhould believe the Doctrines of the Goſpel to be Truths,

not all, neceſſary Truths, for all are not ſo, and conſequently, the repugnant Errors to be falſhoods; yet not all ſuch falſhoods, as unavoidably draw with them damnation upon all that hold them, for all do not ſo.

53. Yea but *you ſay, it is very requiſite we ſhould agree upon a particular Catalogue of Fundamental points, for without ſuch a Catalogue, no man can be aſſured whether or no, he hath Faith ſufficient to Salvation.* This I utterly deny as a thing evidently falſe, and I wonder you ſhould content your ſelf magiſterially to ſay ſo, without offering any proof of it. I might much more juſtly, think it enough barely to deny it, without refutation, but I will not. Thus therefore I argue againſt it. Without being able to make a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I may be aſſured of the Truth of this Aſſertion, if it be true, That *the Scripture contains all neceſſary points of Faith*, and know that I believe explicitely all that is expreſt in Scripture, and implicitely all that is contained in them: Now he that believes all this, muſt of neceſſity believe all things neceſſary; Therefore without being able to make a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I may be aſſured that I believe all things neceſſary, and conſequently that my Faith is ſufficient. I ſaid, of the truth of this Aſſertion, *if it be true:* Becauſe I will not here enter into the Queſtion of the truth of it, it being ſufficient for my preſent purpoſe, that it may be true, and may be believed without any dependence upon a Catalogue of Fundamentals. And therefore if this be all your reaſon, to demand a particular Catalogue of Fundamentals, we cannot but think your demand unreaſonable. Eſpecially having your ſelf expreſſed the cauſe of the difficulty of it, and that is, *Becauſe Scripture doth deliver Divine Truths, but ſeldom qualifies them, or declares whether they be or be not abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation.* Yet not ſo ſeldom, but that out of it I could give you an abſtract of the Eſſential parts of Chriſtianity, if it were neceſſary, but I have ſhewed it not ſo, by confuting your reaſon, pretended for the neceſſity of it, and at this time I have no leiſure to do you courteſies that are ſo troubleſom to my ſelf. Yet thus much I will promiſe, that when

when you deliver *a particular Catalogue of your Church Propoſals* with one hand, you ſhall receive a particular Catalogue of what I conceive Fundamental, with the other. For as yet, I ſee no ſuch fair proceeding as you talk of, nor any performance on your own part of that which ſo clamorouſly you require on ours. For as for the Catalogue which here you have given us, in ſaying. *You are obliged under pain of damnation to believe whatſoever the Catholick viſible Church of Chriſt propoſeth as revealed by Almighty God*, it is like a covey of one *Patridg*, or a flock of one ſheep, or a Fleet compoſed of one Ship, or an Army of one man. The Author of *Charity Miſtaken, demands a particular Cataloge of Fundamental points*; And *We* (ſay you) *again and again demand ſuch a Catalogue.* And ſurely, if this one Propoſition, which here you think to ſtop our mouths with, be a Catalogue, yet at leaſt ſuch a Catalogue it is not, and therefore as yet you have not performed what you require. For if to ſet down ſuch a Propoſition, wherein are comprized all points taught by us to be neceſſary to Salvation, will ſerve you inſtead of a Catalogue, you ſhall have Catalogues enough. As, we are obliged to believe all under pain of damnation which God commands us to believe. There's one Catalogue. We are obliged under pain of damnation, to believe all, whereof we may be ſufficiently aſſured, that Chriſt taught it his Apoſtles, his Apoſtles the Church. There's another. We are obliged under pain of damnation to believe Gods Word, and all contained in it to be true. There's a third. If theſe generalities will not ſatisfie you, but you will be importuning us to tell you in particular, what they are which Chriſt taught his Apoſtles, and his Apoſtles the Church, what points are contained in Gods Word; Then I beſeech you do us reaſon, and give us a particular and *exact Inventory of all your Church Propoſals, without leaving out, or adding any*, ſuch a one which all the Doctors of your Church will ſubſcribe to, and if you receive not then a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I for my part will give you leave to proclaim us Banckrupts.

54. Beſides this deceitful generality of your Catalogue (as you call it,) another main fault we find with it, that it is extreamly ambiguous; and therefore to draw you out of the Clouds, give me leave to propoſe ſome Queſtions to you concerning it. I would know therefore, whether by believing, you mean explicitely or implicitely? If you mean implicitely, I would know whether your Churches infallibility be under pain of damnation to be believed explicitely, or no? Whether any one point or points beſides this, be under the ſame penalty, to be believed explicitely, or no? And if any, what they be? I would know what you eſteem the Propoſals of the Catholick Viſible Church? In particular, whether the Decree of a *Pope ex Cathedra*, that is, with an intent to oblige all Chriſtians by it, be a ſufficient and an obliging propoſal? Whether men without danger of damnation may examine ſuch a Decree, and if they think they have juſt cauſe, refuſe to obey it? Whether the Decree of a Council, without the *Popes* confirmation, be ſuch an obliging Propoſal, or no? Whether it be ſo in caſe there be no *Pope*, or in caſe it be doubtful who is *Pope*? Whether the Decree of a general Council confirmed by the *Pope*, be ſuch a Propoſal, and whether he be an *Heretick* that thinks otherwiſe? Whether the Decree of a particular Council confirmed by the *Pope*, be ſuch a Propoſal? Whether the General uncondemned practice of the Church for ſome Ages be ſuch a ſufficient Propoſition? Whether the conſent of the moſt eminent Fathers of any Age, agreeing in the affirmation of any Doctrine, not contradicted by any of their Contemporaries, be a ſufficient Propoſition? Whether the Fathers teſtifying ſuch or ſuch a Doctrine or Practice to be Tradition, or to be the Doctrine or Practice of the Church, be a ſufficient aſſurance that it is ſo? Whether we be bound under pain of damnation, to believe every Text of the Vulgar Bible, now Authorized by the *Roman Church*, to be the true Tranſlation of the Originals of the Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles, without any the leaſt alteration? Whether they that lived when the Bible

Bible of *Sixtus* was ſet forth, were bound under pain of damnation to believe the ſame of that? And if not of that, of what Bible they were bound to believe it? Whether the Catholick Viſible Church be alwaies that Society of Chriſtians which adheres to the Biſhop of *Rome*? Whether every Chriſtian, that hath ability and opportunity, be not bound to endeavour to know Explicitely the Propoſals of the Church? Whether Implicite Faith in the Churches Veracity, will not ſave him that Actually and Explicitely disbelieves ſome Doctrine of the Church, not knowing it to be ſo; and Actually believes ſome damnable *Hereſie*, as that God has the ſhape of a man? Whether an ignorant man be bound to believe any point to be decreed by the Church, when his Prieſt or Ghoſtly Father aſſures him it is ſo? Whether his Ghoſtly Father may not Err in telling him ſo, and whether any man can be obliged under pain of damnation, to believe an Error? Whether he be bound to believe ſuch a thing defined, when a number of Prieſts, perhaps Ten or Twenty tell him it is ſo? And what aſſurance he can have, that they neither Err, nor deceive him in this matter? Why Implicite Faith in Chriſt, or the Scriptures ſhould not ſuffice for a mans Salvation, as well as implicite Faith in the Church? Whether when you ſay, *Whatſoever the Church propoſeth*, you mean all that ever ſhe propoſed, or that only which ſhe now propoſeth; and whether ſhe now propoſeth all that ever ſhe did propoſe? Whether all the Books of Canonical Scripture were ſufficiently declared to the Church to be ſo, and propoſed as ſuch by the Apoſtles? And if not, from whom the Church had this declaration afterwards? If ſo, whether all men ever ſince the Apoſtles time, were bound under pain of damnation to believe the Epiſtle of S. *James*, and the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* to be Canonical; at leaſt, not to disbelieve it, and believe the contrary? Laſtly, why it is not ſufficient for any mans Salvation to uſe the beſt means he can to inform his Conſcience, and to follow the direction of it? To all theſe demands when you have given fair and ingenious anſwers, you ſhall hear further from me.

55. Ad

55. Ad §. 20.] At the firſt entrance into this Parag. from our own Doctrine, *That the Church cannot Err in Points neceſſary, it is concluded if we are wiſe, we muſt forſake it in nothing, leaſt we ſhould forſake it in ſomething neceſſary.* To which I anſwer, Firſt, that the ſuppoſition as you underſtand it, is falſly impoſed upon us, and as we underſtand it will do you no ſervice. For when we ſay, that there ſhall be *a Church alwaies*, ſomewhere or other, *unerring in Fundamentals*, our meaning is but this, that *there ſhall be alwaies a Church*, to the very being whereof it is repugnant that it ſhould Err in Fundamentals; for if it ſhould do ſo, it would want the very eſſence of a Church, and therefore ceaſe to be a Church. But we never annexed this priviledg *to any one Church of any one Denomination*, as the *Greek* or the *Roman* Church: which if we had done, and ſet up ſome ſetled certain Society of Chriſtians, diſtinguiſhable from all others by adhering to ſuch a Biſhop for our Guide in Fundamentals, then indeed, and then only might you with ſome colour, though with no certainty, have concluded that we could not in Wiſdom, *forſake this Church in any point, for fear of forſaking it in a neceſſary point.* But now that we ſay not this of any one determinate Church, which alone can perform the Office of Guide or Director, but indefinitely of the Church, meaning no more but this, *That there ſhall be alwaies in ſome place or other, ſome Church that Errs not in Fundamentals*; will you conclude from hence, that we cannot in Wiſdom forſake this or that, the *Roman* or the *Greek* Church, for fear of Erring in Fundamentals?

56. Yea, but you may ſay (for I will make the beſt I can of all your Arguments,) *That this Church thus unerring in Fundamentals, when* Luther *aroſe, was by our confeſſion the* Roman; *and therefore we ought not in Wiſdom to have departed from it in any thing.* I anſwer: Firſt, that we confeſs no ſuch thing, that the Church of *Rome* was then this Church, but only a Part of it, and that the moſt corrupted and moſt incorrigible. Secondly, that if by adhering to the Church, we could have been thus far ſecured, this Argument had ſome ſhew of reaſon. But

ſeeing

ſeeing we are not warranted thus much by any priviledg of that Church, that ſhe cannot Err Fundamentally, but only from Scripture, which aſſures us that ſhe doth Err very heinouſly, collect our hope, that the Truths ſhe retains and the practice of them, may prove an Antidote to her, againſt the Errors which ſhe maintains in ſuch Perſons, as in ſimplicity of Heart follow this *Abſalom*; we ſhould then do againſt the light of our Conſcience, and ſo ſin damnably if we ſhould not abandon the profeſſion of her Errors though not Fundamental. Neither can we thus conclude, we may ſafely hold with the Church of *Rome* in all her points, for ſhe cannot Err damnably; For this is falſe, ſhe may, though perhaps ſhe does not: But rather thus, Theſe points of Chriſtianity, which have in them the nature of Antidotes againſt the Poyſon of all Sins and Errors, the Church of *Rome*, though otherwiſe much corrupted, ſtill retains; therefore we hope ſhe Errs not Fundamentally, but ſtill remains a Part of the Church. But this can be no warrant to us to think with her in all things: ſeeing the very ſame Scripture, which puts us in hope ſhe Errs not Fundamentally, aſſures us that in many things, and thoſe of great moment ſhe Errs very greviouſly. And theſe Errors though to them that believe them, we hope they will not be pernitious, yet the profeſſing of them againſt Conſcience, could not but bring us to certain damnation. *As for the fear of departing from ſome Fundamental Truths withal, while we depart from her Errors,* Happily it might work upon us, if adhering to her might ſecure us from it, and if nothing elſe could: But both theſe are falſe. For firſt, adhering to her in all things cannot ſecure us from erring in Fundamentals: Becauſe though *de facto* we hope ſhe does not Err, yet we know no priviledges ſhe has, but ſhe may Err in them her ſelf: and therefore we had need have better ſecurity hereof than her bare Authority. Then ſecondly, without dependence on her at all, we may be ſecured that we do not Err Fundamentally; I mean by believing all thoſe things plainly ſet down in Scripture, wherein all things neceſſary, and moſt

moſt things profitable are plainly delivered. Suppoſe I were Travelling to *London*, and knew two ways thither, the one very ſafe and convenient, the other very inconvenient, and dangerous, but yet a way to *London*: and that I overtook a Paſſenger on the way, who himſelf believed, and would fain perſwade me, there was no other way but the worſe, and would perſwade me to accompany him in it, becauſe I confeſſed his way, though very inconvenient, yet a way; ſo that going that way we could not fail of our Journies end, by the conſent of both Parties: but he believed, my way to be none at all; and therefore I might juſtly fear, leſt out of a deſire of leaving the worſt way, I left the true, and the only way: If now I ſhould not be more ſecure upon my own knowledge, than frighted by this fallacity, would you not beg me for a Fool? Juſt ſo might you think of us, if we would be frighted out of our own knowledge by this bugbear. For the only and the main reaſon why we believe you not to Err in Fundamentals, is your holding the *Doctrines of Faith in Chriſt and Repentance:* which knowing we hold as well as you, notwithſtanding our departure from you, we muſt needs know that we not Err in Fundamentals, as well as we know that you do not Err in ſome Fundamentals, and therefore cannot poſſibly fear the contrary. Yet let us be more liberal to you, and grant that which can never be proved, that God had ſaid in plain terms, *The Church of* Rome *ſhall never deſtroy the Foundation*, but withal had ſaid, *that it might and would lay much Hay and Stubble upon it*; That you ſhould never hold any Error deſtructive of Salvation, but yet many that were prejudicial to Edification: I demand, might we have diſpenſed with our ſelves in the believing and profeſſing theſe Errors in regard of the ſmalneſs of them? Or had it not been a damnable ſin to do ſo, though the Errors in themſelves were not damnable? Had we not had as plain Direction to depart from you in ſome things profitable, as to adhere to you in things neceſſary? In the beginning of your Book, when it was for your purpoſe to have it ſo, the greatneſs or ſmalneſs of

the

the matter was not conſiderable, the Evidence of the Revelation was all in all. But here we muſt err with you in ſmall things, for fear of looſing your direction in greater: and for fear of departing too far from you, not go from you at all, even where we ſee plainly that you have departed from the Truth.

57. Beyond all this, I ſay, that this which you ſay *in wiſdom we are to do*, is not only unlawful, but, if we will proceed according to reaſon, impoſſible. I mean to adhere to you in all things, having no other ground for it, but becauſe you are (as we will now ſuppoſe) Infallible in ſome things, that is, in Fundamentals. For, whether by skill in Architecture a large ſtructure may be ſupported by a narrow foundation, I know not; but ſure I am, in reaſon, no concluſion can be larger than the Principles on which it is founded. And therefore if I conſider what I do, and be perſwaded, that your infallibility, is but limited, and particular, and partial, my adherence upon this ground, cannot poſſibly be Abſolute and Univerſal and Total. I am confident, that ſhould I meet with ſuch a man amongſt you (as I am well aſſur'd there be many) that would grant your Church Infallible only in Fundamentals, which what they are he knows not, and therefore upon this only reaſon adheres to you in all things: I ſay that I am confident, that it may be demonſtrated, that ſuch a man adheres to you, with a fiducial and certain aſſent in nothing. To make this clear (becauſe at the firſt hearing it may ſeem ſtrange) give me leave, good Sir, to ſuppoſe you the man, and to propoſe to you a few queſtions, and to give for you ſuch anſwers to them, as upon this ground you muſt of neceſſity give, were you preſent with me. Firſt, ſuppoſing you hold your Church Infallible in Fundamentals, obnoxious to Error in other things, and that you know not what points are Fundamental, I demand, *C.* Why do you believe the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation? *K.* becauſe the Church hath taught it, which is Infallible. *C.* What? Infallible in all things, or only in Fundamentals? *K.* in Fundamentals only. *C.* Then in other points ſhe may err? *K.* ſhe may. *C.* and do you know

what Points are Fundamental, what not? *K.* No, and therefore I believe her in all things, leaſt I ſhould disbelieve her in fundamentals. *C.* How know you then, whether this be a fundamental point or no? *K.* I know not. *C.* It may be then (for ought you know) an unfundamental point? *K.* yes, it may be ſo. *C.* And in theſe you ſaid the Church may err? *K.* yes I did ſo. *C.* Then poſſibly it may err in this? *K.* It may do ſo. *C.* Then what certainty have you, that it does not err in it? *K.* None at all, but upon this ſuppoſition, that this is a Fundamental. *C.* And this ſuppoſition you are uncertain of? *K.* Yes, I told you ſo before. *C.* And therefore, you can have no certainty of that, which depends upon this uncertainty, ſaving only a ſuppoſitive certainty, if it be a Fundamental truth, which is in plain Engliſh to ſay, you are certain it is true, if it be both true and neceſſary. Verily Sir, if you have no better Faith than this, you are no Catholick. *K.* good words I pray! I am ſo, and God willing will be ſo. *C.* You mean, in outward profeſſion and practice, but in belief you are not, no more than a *Proteſtant* is a *Catholick*. For every *Proteſtant* yields ſuch a kind of aſſent to all the propoſals of the Church, for ſurely they believe them true, if they be Fundamental Truths. And therefore you muſt either believe the Church Infallible in all her propoſals, be they foundations, or be they ſuperſtructions, or elſe you muſt believe all Fundamental which ſhe propoſes, or elſe you are no *Catholick*. *K.* But I have been taught, that *ſeeing I believed the Church Infallible in points neceſſary, in wiſdom I was to believe her in every thing*. *C.* That was a pretty plauſible inducement, to bring you hither, but now you are here, you muſt go farther, and believe her Infallible in all things, or elſe you were as good go back again, which will be a great diſparagement to you, and draw upon you both the bitter and implacable hatred of our part, and even with your own, the imputation of raſhneſs and levity. You ſee, I hope, by this time, that though a man did believe your Church Infallible in Fundamentals, yet he has no reaſon to do you the courteſie, of believing all her propoſals; nay if he be ignorant what

theſe Fundamentals are, he has no certain ground to believe her, upon her Authority in any thing. And whereas you ſay, it can be no imprudence to err with the Church; I ſay, it may be very great imprudence, if the queſtion be, Whether we ſhould err with the preſent Church, or hold true with God Almighty.

60. Whereas you add, That *that viſible Church which cannot err in Fundamental, propounds all her definitions without diſtinction to be believed under* Anathema's: *Anſ.* Again you beg the queſtion, ſuppoſing untruly, that there is, any *that Viſible Church*, I mean any Viſible Church of one Denomination, which cannot err in points Fundamental. Secondly, propoſing definitions to be believed under Anathema's, is no good argument, that the Propounders conceive themſelves infallible; but only, that they conceive the Doctrine they condemn is evidently damnable. A plain proof hereof is this, that particular Councils, nay particular men, have been very liberal of their Anathema's, which yet were never conceived infallible, either by others or themſelves. If any man ſhould now deny Chriſt to be the Saviour of the world, or deny the Reſurrection, I ſhould make no great ſcruple of Anathematizing his Doctrine, and yet am very far from dreaming of Infallibility.

61. The effect of the next Argument is this, *I cannot without grievous ſin diſobey the Church, unleſs I know ſhe commands thoſe things which are not in her power to command: and how far this power extends, none can better inform me than the Church. Therefore I am to obey, ſo far as the Church requires my obedience.* I Anſwer, Firſt, That neither hath the *Catholick Church*, but only a corrupt part of it declared her ſelf, nor required our obedience, in the points conteſted among us. This therefore is falſely, and vainly ſuppoſed here by you, being one of the greateſt queſtions amongſt us. Then Secondly, That God can better inform us, what are the limits of the Churches power, than the Church her ſelf, that is, than the *Roman* Clergy, who being men ſubject to the ſame paſſions with other men, why they ſhould be thought the beſt Judges in their own

cauſe, I do not well underſtand! But yet we oppoſe againſt them, no human deciſive Judges, not any Sect or Perſon, but only God and his Word. And therefore it is in vain to ſay, That *in following her, you ſhall be ſooner excuſed, than in following any Sect or Man applying Scriptures againſt her Doctrine:* In as much as we never went about to arrogate to our ſelves that Infallibility or abſolute Authority, which we take away from you. But if you would have ſpoken to the purpoſe, you ſhould have ſaid, that in following her you ſhould ſooner have been excuſed, than in cleaving to the Scripture, and to God himſelf.

63. Whereas you ſay, *The fearful examples of innumerable perſons, who forſaking the Church, upon pretence of her errors, have failed even in fundamental points, ought to deter all Chriſtians from oppoſing her in any one doctrine or practice*; This is, juſt as if you ſhould ſay, divers men have fallen into *Scylla*, with going too far from *Charybdis*, be ſure therefore ye keep cloſe to *Charybdis:* divers leaving prodigality, have fallen into covetouſneſs, therefore be you conſtant to prodigality; many have fallen from worſhipping God perverſely and fooliſhly, not to worſhip him at all, from worſhipping many Gods, to worſhip none; this therefore ought to deter men, from leaving Superſtition or Idolatry, for fear of falling into Atheiſm and Impiety. This is your counſel and Sophiſtry: but God ſays clean contrary; *Take heed you ſwerve not, either to the right hand or to the left: you muſt not do evil that good may come thereon*; therefore neither that you may avoid a greater evil, you muſt not be obſtinate in a certain error, for fear of an uncertain. What if ſome, forſaking the Church of *Rome*, have forſaken Fundamental Truths? Was this becauſe they forſook the Church of *Rome*? No ſure, this is *non cauſa pro cauſa:* for elſe all that have forſaken that Church ſhould have done ſo, which we ſay they have not. But becauſe they went too far from her, the golden mean, the narrow way is hard to be found, and hard to be kept; hard, but not impoſſible: hard, but yet you muſt not pleaſe your ſelf out of it, though you err on the right hand, though you offend on the milder part, for this is

the

the only way that leads to life, and few there be that find it. It is true, if we ſaid, there were no danger in being of the *Roman* Church, and there were danger in leaving it, it were madneſs to perſwade any man to leave it. But we proteſt and proclaim the contrary, and that we have very little hope of their Salvation, who either out of negligence in ſeeking the truth, or unwillingneſs to find it, live and die in the errors and impieties of that Church: and therefore cannot but conceive thoſe fears to be moſt fooliſh and ridiculous, which perſwade men to be conſtant in one way to hell, leſt happily if they leave it, they ſhould fall into another.

64. Obj. *Some Proteſtants, pretending to reform the Church, are come to affirm that ſhe periſhed for many Ages, which others cannot deny to be a Fundamental Error againſt the Article of the Creed, I believe the Catholick Church, and affirm the* Donatiſts *erred Fundamentally in confining it to* Africa.

To this I Anſwer, Firſt, that the error of the *Donatiſts* was not, that they held it poſſible that ſome, or many, or moſt parts of *Chriſtendom*, might fall away from Chriſtianity, and that the Church may looſe much of her amplitude, and be contracted to a narrow compaſs in compariſon of her former extent; which is proved not only poſſible but certain, by irrefragable experience. For who knows not, that *Gentiliſm*, and *Mahumetiſm*, mans wickedneſs deſerving it, and Gods providence permitting it, have prevailed to the utter extirpation of Chriſtianity, upon far the greater part of the world? And S. *Auſtin* when he was out of the heat of Diſputation, confeſſes the Militant Church to be *like the Moon*, ſometimes increaſing, and ſometimes decreaſing. This therefore was no error in the *Donatiſts*, that they held it poſſible, that the Church, from a larger extent, might be contradicted to a leſſer: or that they held it poſſible to be reduced to *Africa*; (For why not to *Africk* then, as well as within theſe few ages, you pretend it was to *Europe?*) But their error was, that they held *de facto*, this was done when they had no juſt ground or reaſon to do ſo; and ſo upon a vain pretence which they could not juſtify, ſeparated themſelves from the communion of all

all other parts of the Church: and that they required it as a neceſſary condition to make a man a member of the Church, that he ſhould be of their Communion, and divide himſelf from all other Communions from which they were divided: which was a condition both unneceſſary and unlawful to be required, and therefore the exacting of it was directly oppoſite to the Churches Catholiciſm; in the very ſame nature with their Errors who required Circumciſion, and the keeping of the Law of *Moſes* as neceſſary to ſalvation. For whoſoever requires harder or heavier conditions of men, than God requires of them, he it is that is properly an Enemy of the Churches Univerſality, by hindring either Men or Countries from adjoyning themſelves to it; which, were it not for theſe unneceſſary and therefore unlawful conditions, in probability would have made them members of it. And ſeeing the preſent Church of *Rome* perſwades men they were as good (for any hope of Salvation they have) not to be Chriſtians as not to be *Roman* Catholicks, believe nothing at all, as not to believe all which they impoſe upon them: Be abſolutely out of the Churches Communion, as be out of their Communion, or be in any other, whether they be not guilty of the ſame crime, with the *Donatiſts* and thoſe Zelots of the Moſaical Law, I leave it to the judgment of thoſe that underſtand reaſon! This is ſufficient to ſhew the vanity of this Argument. But I add moreover, that you neither have named thoſe *Proteſtants* who held the Church to have periſhed for many ages; who perhaps held not the deſtruction but the corruption of the Church; not that the true Church, but that the pure Church periſhed: or rather that the Church periſhed not from its life and exiſtence, but from its purity and integrity, or perhaps from its ſplendor and viſibility. Neither have you proved by any one reaſon, but only affirmed it, to be a fundamental Error, to hold that the Church Militant may poſſibly be driven out of the world, and aboliſhed for a time from the face of the earth.

69. Ad §. 23. In all theſe Texts of Scripture, which are here alledged in this laſt Section of this Chapter, or in any one of them, or in any other, doth God ſay clearly and plainly,

plainly, *The Biſhop of* Rome *and that Society of Chriſtians which adheres to him ſhall be ever the infallible guide of Faith?* You will confeſs, I preſume, he doth not, and will pretend, it was not neceſſary. Yet if the King ſhould tell us the Lord-Keeper ſhould judge ſuch and ſuch cauſes, but ſhould either not tell us at all, or tell us but doubtfully who ſhould be Lord-Keeper, ſhould we be any thing the nearer for him to an end of contentions? Nay rather would not the diſſentions about the Perſon who it is, increaſe contentions, rather than end them? Juſt ſo it would have been, if God had appointed a Church to be Judge of Controverſies, and had not told us which was that Church. Seeing therefore God does nothing in vain, and ſeeing it had been in vain, to appoint a Judge of Controverſies, and not to tell us plainly who it is, and ſeeing laſtly, he hath not told us plainly, no not at all who it is, is it not evident he hath appointed none? *Obj.* But (you will ſay perhaps) *if it be granted once, that ſome Church of one denomination, is the Infallible guide of Faith, it will be no difficult thing to prove, that yours is the Church, ſeeing no other Church pretends to be ſo.* Anſ. Yes, the Primitive and the Apoſtolick Church pretends to be ſo. That aſſures us, that the *ſpirit was promiſed, and given to them, to lead them into all ſaving truth,* that they might lead others. Obj. *But that Church is not now in the world, and how then can it pretend to be the guide of Faith? Anſ.* It is now in the world ſufficiently, to be our guide: not by the perſons of thoſe men that were members of it, but by their Writings which do plainly teach us, what truth they were led into, and ſo lead us into the ſame truth. Obj. *But theſe Writings, were the Writings of ſome particular men, and not of the Church of thoſe times: how then doth that Church guide us by theſe Writings? Now theſe places ſhew that a Church is to be our guide, therefore they cannot be ſo avoided. Anſ.* If you regard the conception and production of theſe Writings, they were the Writings of particular men: But if you regard the reception, and approbation of them, they may be well called the Writings of the Church, as having the atteſtation of the Church, to have been written by thoſe that were inſpired, and directed

directed by God. As a Statute, though penned by ſome one man, yet being ratified by the Parliament, is called the Act, not of that man, but of the Parliament. Obj. But the *words ſeem clearly enough to prove, that the Church, the preſent Church of every Age, is Univerſally infallible.* *Anſ.* For my part, I know I am as willing and deſirous, that the Biſhop or Church of *Rome* ſhould be Infallible, (provided I might know it) as they are to be ſo eſteemed. But he that would not be deceived muſt take heed, that he take not his deſire that a thing ſhould be ſo, for a reaſon that it is ſo. For if you look upon Scripture, through ſuch Spectacles as theſe, they will appear to you, of what colour pleaſes your fancies beſt: and will ſeem to ſay, not what they do ſay, but what you would have them. As ſome ſay the *Manna*, wherewith the *Iſraelites* were fed in the Wilderneſs, had in every mans mouth, that very taſt which was moſt agreeable to his palate. For my part I profeſs, I have conſidered them a thouſand times, and have looked upon them (as they ſay,) on both ſides, and yet to me they ſeem to ſay no ſuch matter.

70. Not the Firſt, *Mat.* 16.18.) For the *Church may err, and yet the gates of Hell not prevail againſt her.* It may err, and yet continue ſtill a true Church, and bring forth Children unto God, and ſend Souls to Heaven. And therefore this can do you no ſervice, without the plain begging of the point in Queſtion. *Viz.* That every Error is one of the gates of Hell. Which we abſolutely deny, and therefore, you are not to ſuppoſe, but to prove it. Neither is our denial without reaſon. For ſeeing you do, and muſt grant, that a particular Church may hold ſome error, and yet be ſtill a true member of the Church: why may not the Univerſal Church, hold the ſame error, and yet remain the true Univerſal?

71. Not the Second or Third. (*John* 14. 16, 17. *John* 16.13.) For *the ſpirit of Truth, may be with a Man, or a Church for ever, and teach him all Truth:* And yet he may fall into ſome error, if this, *all*, be not *ſimply all*, but all of ſome kind.

Secondly,

Secondly, he may fall into ſome Error, even contrary to the truth which is taught him, if it be taught him *only ſufficiently, and not irreſiſtibly*, ſo that he may learn it if he will, not ſo that he muſt and ſhall, whether he will or no. Now who can aſſertain me, that the Spirits teaching is not of this nature? Or how can you poſſibly reconcile it, with your Doctrine of free-will in believing, if it be not of this nature? Beſides, the word in the Original is ὁδηγόυ, which ſignifies, to be a guide and director only, not to compel or neceſſitate. Who knows not, that a guide may ſet you in the right way, and you may either negligently miſtake, or willingly leave it? And to what purpoſe doth God conplain ſo often, and ſo earneſtly of ſome, that *had eyes to ſee and would not ſee, that ſtopped their Ears, and cloſed their Eyes, leſt they ſhould hear and ſee?* Of others *that would not underſtand, leſt they ſhould do good: that the Light ſhined, and the Darkneſs comprehended it not:* That *he came unto his own, and his own received him not: That light came into the World, and Men loved Darkneſs more than Light: To what purpoſe ſhould he wonder, ſo few believed his report, and that to ſo few his Arm was revealed: And that when he comes, he ſhould find no Faith upon Earth; If his outward teaching were not of this nature*, that it might be followed, and might be reſiſted? And if it be, then God may teach, and the Church not learn: God may lead, and the Church be refractory and not follow. And indeed, who can doubt, that hath not his Eyes vailed with prejudice, that God hath taught the Church of *Rome* plain enough in the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, that *all things in the Church are to be done for edification*, and that, in any publick Prayers, or Thanks-givings, or Hymns, or Leſſons of inſtruction, to *uſe a Language*, which the aſſiſtants *generally underſtand not*, is not for edification? Though the Church of *Rome* will not learn this, for fear of confeſſing an Error, and ſo overthrowing her Authority, yet the time will come, when it ſhall appear, that not only by ſcripture, they were taught this ſufficiently, and commanded to believe, but by reaſon and

common ſenſe. And ſo for the Communion, in both kinds, who can deny but they are taught it by our Saviour *John* 6. in theſe Words, according to moſt of your own expoſitions, *Unleſs you Eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, you have no Life in you.* (If our Saviour ſpeak there of the Sacrament, as to them he does, becauſe they conceive he does ſo.) Though they may pretend, that receiving in one kind, they receive the Blood together with the Body, yet they can with no Face pretend that they drink it: And ſo obey not our Saviours injunction according to the letter, which yet they *profeſs is literally, always to be obeyed, unleſs ſome impiety, or ſome abſurdity force us to the contrary*: and they are not yet arrived to that impudence to pretend, that either there is impiety or abſurdity in receiving the Communion in both kinds. This therefore they if not others, are plainly taught by our Saviour in this place. But by S. *Paul* all without exception, when he ſays, *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him Eat of this Bread and Drink of this Chalice.* This (*a Man*) that is to examine himſelf, is *every man*, that can do it: as is confeſſed on all hands. And therefore it is all one, as if he had ſaid, *let every man examine himſelf, and ſo let him Eat of this Bread, and Drink of this Cup.* They which acknowledg Saint *Pauls* Epiſtes, and Saint *Johns* Goſpel to be the Word of God, one would think ſhould not deny, but that they are taught theſe two Doctrines plain enough. Yet we ſee they neither do, nor will learn them. I conclude therefore, that the Spirit may very well teach the Church, and yet the Church fall into and continue in Error, by not regarding what ſhe is taught by the Spirit.

72. But all this I have ſpoken upon a ſuppoſition only, and ſhewed unto you, that though theſe promiſes, had been made unto the preſent Church of every Age (I might have ſaid though they had been to the Church of *Rome* by name,) yet no certainty of her Univerſal Infallibility could be built upon them. But the plain truth is, that theſe Promiſes are vainly arrogated by you, and were never made to you, but to the Apoſtles

ſtles only. I pray deal ingenuouſly and tell me, who were they of whom our Saviour ſays, *Theſe things have I ſpoken unto you, being preſent with you.* c. 14. 25. *But the comforter, ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatſoever I have told you* v. 26? Who are they to whom he ſays, *I go away and come again unto you; and I have told you before it come to paſs:* v. 28. 29. *You have been with me from the beginning:* c. 15. v. 27? And again, *theſe things I have told you, that when the time ſhall come, you may remember that I told you of them: and theſe things I ſaid not to you at the beginning, becauſe I was with you,* c. 16. 4. *And becauſe I ſaid theſe things unto you, ſorrow hath filled your Hearts,* v. 6? Laſtly, who are they of whom he ſaith, v. 12. *I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now?* Do not all theſe circumſtances appropriate this whole diſcourſe of our Saviour to his Diſciples, that were then with him, and conſequently, reſtrain the Promiſes of the Spirit of truth, which was *to lead them into all truth,* to their Perſons only? And ſeeing it is ſo, is it not an impertinent arrogance and preſumption, for you to lay claim unto them, in the behalf of your Church? Had Chriſt been preſent with your Church? Did the Comforter bring theſe things to the Remembrance of your Church, which Chriſt had before taught and ſhe had forgotten? Was Chriſt then departing from your Church? And did he tell of his departure before it came to paſs? Was your Church with him from the beginning? Was your Church filled with ſorrow, upon the mentioning of Chriſts departure? Or laſtly, did he, or could he have ſaid to your Church, which then was not extant, *I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now?* as he ſpeaks in the 13. *verſ.* immediately before the words by you quoted. And then goes on, *Howbeit when the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth.* Is it not the ſame *You* he ſpeaks to, in the 13. *verſ.* and that he ſpeaks to in the 14? And is it not apparent to any one that has but half an Eye, that in the 13. he ſpeaks only to them that then were with him? Beſides in the very Text by you

alledged, there are things promiſed, which your Church cannot with any modeſty pretend to. For there it is ſaid, *the Spirit of Truth*, not only *will guide you into all Truth*, but alſo *will ſhew you things to come.* Now your Church (for ought I could ever underſtand) does not ſo much as pretend to the Spirit of Propheſie, and knowledge of future events: And therefore hath as little cauſe to pretend to the former promiſe, of being *led by the Spirit into all truth.* And this is the Reaſon, why both You in this place, and generally, your writers of Controverſies, when they entreat of this Argument, cite this Text perpetually by halfs, there being in the latter part of it, a clear, and convincing Demonſtration, that you have nothing to do with the former. Unleſs you will ſay, which which is moſt ridiculous, that when our Saviour ſaid, *He will teach you*, &c. and *he will ſhew you*, &c. He meant one *You* in the former clauſe, and another *You* in the latter.

73. *Obj.* But this *is to confine Gods Spirit to the Apoſtles only, or to the Diſciples, that then were preſent with him: which is directly contrary to many places of Scripture.* Anſ. I confeſs, that to confine the Spirit of God to thoſe that were then preſent with Chriſt is againſt Scripture. But I hope it is eaſie to conceive a difference, between confining the *Spirit of God* to them: and confining *the Promiſes made in this place* to them. God may do many things which he does not Promiſe at all: much more, which he does not promiſe in ſuch or ſuch a place.

74. *Obj.* But *it is promiſed in the* 14. *Chap. that this Spirit ſhall abide with them for ever: Now they in their perſons were not to abide for ever; and therefore the Spirit could not abide with them, in their Perſons for ever, ſeeing the coexiſtence of two things, ſuppoſes of neceſſity, the exiſtence of either. Therefore the promiſe was not made to them only in their Perſons, but by them to the Church, which was to abide for ever.* Anſ. Your Concluſion is, *not to them only*, but your Reaſon concludes, either nothing at all, or that this Promiſe of abiding with them for ever, was not made to their Perſons at all; or if it were, that it was not performed. Or if you will not ſay (as I hope you will not) that it was

not

not performed, nor that it was not made to their Perſons at all; then muſt you grant, that the Word *for ever*, is here uſed in a ſenſe reſtrained, and accommodated to the ſubject here entreated of; and that it ſignifies, *not Eternally*, without end of time, *but perpetually* without interruption, for the time of their lives. So that the force, and ſenſe of the Words is, that they ſhould never want the Spirits aſſiſtance, in the performance of their function: And that the Spirit would not (as Chriſt was to do,) ſtay with them for a time, and afterwards leave them, but would abide with them, if they kept their ſtation, unto the very end of their lives, which is mans *for ever*. Neither is this uſe of the word, *for ever*, any thing ſtrange, either in our ordinary ſpeech, wherein we uſe to ſay, this is mine for ever, this ſhall be yours for ever, without ever dreaming of the Eternity, either of the thing or Perſons. And then in Scripture, it not only will bear, but requires this ſenſe very frequently, as *Exod.* 21. 6. *Deut.* 15. 17. *his Maſter ſhall bore his Ear through with an Awl, and he ſhall ſerve him for ever.* Pſal. 52. 9. *I will praiſe thee for ever.* Pſal. 61. 4. *I will abide in thy Tabernacle for ever.* Pſal. 119. 111. *Thy Teſtimonies have I taken as mine Heritage for ever:* and laſtly in the Epiſtle to *Philemon*, *He therefore departed from thee for a time, that thou ſhouldeſt receive him for ever.*

75. And thus, I preſume, I have ſhewed ſufficiently, that this *for ever*, hinders not, but that the promiſe may be appropriated to the Apoſtles, as by many other circumſtances I have evinced it muſt be. But what now, if the place produced by you, as a main pillar of your Churches Infallibility, prove upon Tryal, an Engine to batter and overthrow it, at leaſt, (which is all one to my purpoſe) to take away all poſſibility of our aſſurance of it? This will ſeem ſtrange news to you at firſt hearing, and not far from a prodigy. And I confeſs, as you here in this place, and generally all your Writers of Controverſie, by whom this Text is urged, order the matter, it is very much diſabled, to do any ſervice againſt you in this queſtion. For with a bold ſacriledg, and horrible impiety,

piety, ſomewhat like *Procruſtes* his cruelty, you perpetually cut off the Head and Foot, the beginning and end of it; and preſenting to your confidents, who uſually read no more of the Bible, than is alledged by you, only theſe words, *I will ask my Father, and he ſhall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth*, conceal in the mean time, the words before, and the words after; that ſo, the promiſe of Gods Spirit, may ſeem to be abſolute, whereas it is indeed moſt clearly and expreſly conditional: being both in the words before, reſtrained to thoſe only, that *love God and keep his commandments*: and in the words after, flatly denied to all, whom the Scriptures ſtile by the name of *the World*, that is, as the very *Antitheſis* give us plainly to underſtand, *to all wicked and worldly men*. Behold the place entire, as it is ſet down in your own Bible. *If ye love me keep my Commandments, and I will ask my Father, and he ſhall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the ſpirit of the Truth, whom the World cannot receive.* Now from the place there reſtored and vindicated from your mutilation, thus I argue againſt your pretence. We can have no certainty of the Infallibility of your Church, but upon this ſupoſition, that your *Popes* are infallible in confirming the Decrees of General Councils: we can have no certainty hereof, but upon this ſuppoſition, that the Spirit of truth is promiſed to him, for his direction in this work. And of this again we can have no certainty, but upon ſuppoſal, that he performs the condition, whereunto the promiſe of the Spirit of truth is expreſly limited, *viz. That he love God and keep his Commandments*; and of this finally, not knowing the *Popes* Heart, we can have no certainty at all; therefore from the firſt to the laſt, we can have no certainty at all of your Churches Infallibility. This is my firſt Argument: From this place another follows, which will charge you as home as the former. If many of the *Roman* See, were ſuch men as could not receive the Spirit of Truth, even men of the World, that is Worldly, Wicked, Carnal, Diabolical men, then

the

the Spirit of Truth, is not here promiſed, but flatly denied them: and conſequently we can have no certainty, neither of the Decrees of Councils, which theſe *Popes* confirm, nor of the Churches Infallibility, which is guided by theſe Decrees: But many of the *Roman* See, even by the confeſſion of the moſt zealous Defenders of it, were ſuch men: therefore the Spirit of truth is not here promiſed but denyed them, and conſequently we can have no certainty, neither of the Decrees which they confirm, nor of the Churches Infallibility, which guides her ſelf by theſe Decrees.

76. You may take as much time as you think fit, to anſwer theſe Arguments. In the mean while I proceed to the conſideration of the next Text alledged for this purpoſe by you: out of S. *Paul* 1. Epiſtle to *Timothy*: cap. 3. 15. where he ſaith, as you ſay *the Church is the Pillar and ground of truth*, But the truth is you are ſomewhat too bold with S. *Paul*. For he ſays not in formal terms, what you make him ſay, *the Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth*, neither is it certain that he means ſo: for it is neither impoſſible nor improbable, that the words *the Pillar and Ground of truth*, may have reference not to the Church, but to *Timothy*, the ſenſe of the place *that thou maieſt know how to behave thy ſelf, as a Pillar and ground of truth, in the Church of God, which is the houſe of the living God*, which expoſition offers no violence at all to the words, but only ſuppoſes an Ellipſis of the Particle ὡς, in the Greek very ordinary. Neither wants it ſome likelihood, that S. *Paul* comparing the Church to a Houſe, ſhould here exhort *Timothy*, to carry himſelf, as a Pillar in that Houſe ſhould do, according as he had given other Principal men in the Church, the name of Pillars; rather than, having called the Church a *Houſe*, to call it preſently a *Pillar*; which may ſeem ſomewhat heterogeneous. Yet if you will needs have S. *Paul* refer this not to *Timothy* but the Church, I will not contend about it any farther, than to ſay, poſſibly it may be otherwiſe. But then ſecondly, I am to put you in mind, that the Church which S. *Paul* here ſpeaks of, was that in which *Timothy* converſe-d

verſed, and that was a Particular Church, and not the *Roman*; and ſuch you will not have to be Univerſally Infallible.

77. Thirdly, if we grant you out of Courteſie (for nothing can enforce us to it) that he both ſpeaks of the Univerſal Church, and ſays this of it, then I am to remember you, that many Attributes in Scripture are not Notes of Performance but of Duty, and teach us not what the thing or Perſon is of neceſſity, but what it ſhould be. *Ye are the Salt of the Earth*, ſaid our Saviour to his Diſciples: not that this quality was inſeparable from their Perſons, but becauſe it was their Office to be ſo. For if they muſt have been ſo of neceſſity, and could not have been otherwiſe, in vain had he put them in fear of that which follows, *If the Salt hath loſt his ſavour, wherewith ſhall it be Salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be caſt forth, and to be trodden under Foot.* So the Church may be by Duty, the Pillar and Ground, that is, the Teacher of Truth, of all truth, not only neceſſary but profitable to Salvation; and yet ſhe may neglect and violate this Duty, and be in fact, the teacher of ſome Error.

78. Fourthly and laſtly, if we deal moſt liberally with you, and grant that the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of the Catholick Church, calls it the *Pillar and ground of Truth*, and that not only becauſe it ſhould, but becauſe it always ſhall and will be ſo, yet after all this, you have done nothing; your Bridge is too ſhort, to bring you to the Bank where you would be, unleſs you can ſhew that by truth here, is certainly meant, not only *all neceſſary* to Salvation, but all that is profitable, abſolutely and *ſimply All*. For that the true Church alwaies ſhall be the maintainer and teacher of all neceſſary truth, you know we grant and muſt grant, for it is of the eſſence of the Church to be ſo, and any company of Men were no more a Church without it, than any thing can be a Man, and not be reaſonable. But as a Man may be ſtill a Man, though he want a Hand or an Eye, which yet are profitable parts, ſo the Church may be ſtill a

Church

Church, though it be defective in ſome profitable truth. And as a Man may be a Man, that has ſome Boyls and Botches on his Body, ſo the Church may be the Church, though it have many corruptions both in Doctrine and practice.

79. And thus you ſee we are at liberty from the former places; having ſhewed that the ſenſe of them, either muſt or may be ſuch as will do your Cauſe no ſervice. But the laſt you ſuppoſe, will be a *Gordian* knot, and ties us faſt enough: The words are, *Eph.* 4. 11, 12, 13. *He gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets,* &c. *to the conſummation of Saints, to the work of the Miniſtry,* &c. *Until we all meet into the Unity of Faith,* &c. *That we be not hereafter Children, wavering and carried up and down with every wind of Doctrine.* Out of which words, this is the only argument which you collect, or I can collect for you. There is no means to conſerve unity of Faith, againſt every wind of Doctrine, unleſs it be a Church univerſally Infallible. But it is impious to ſay there is no means to conſerve unity of Faith againſt every wind of Doctrine: Therefore there muſt be a Church univerſally Infallible. Whereunto I anſwer, that your major is ſo far from being confirmed, that it is plainly confuted, by the place alledged. For that tells us of another means for this purpoſe, to wit, the *Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Paſtors, and Doctors,* which Chriſt gave upon his Aſcenſion, and that their *conſummating the Saints, doing the work of the Miniſtry,* and *Edifying the body of Chriſt,* was the means to bring thoſe (which are there ſpoken of, be they who they will,) to *the unity of Faith, and to perfection in Chriſt,* that they might not be *wavering, and carried about, with every wind of falſe Doctrine.* Now the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Paſtors, and Doctors, are not the preſent Church; therefore the Church is not the only means for this end, nor that which is here ſpoken of.

80. Peradventure by, *he gave,* you conceive, is to be underſtood, *he promiſed that he would give unto the worlds end.* But what reaſon have you for this conceit? Can you ſhew that the word, ἔδωκε, hath this ſignification in other

places, and that it muſt have it in this place? Or will not this interpretation drive you preſently to this blaſphemous abſurdity, that God hath not performed his promiſe? Unleſs you will ſay, which for ſhame I think you will not, that you have now, and in all Ages ſince Chriſt have had Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts: for as for Paſtors, and Doctors alone, they will not ſerve the turn. For if God promiſed to give all theſe, then you muſt ſay he hath given all, or elſe that he hath broke his promiſe. Neither may you pretend, that the *Paſtors and Doctors were the-ſame with the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and therefore having Paſtors and Doctors, you have all.* For it is apparent, that by theſe names, are denoted ſeveral Orders of men, clearly diſtinguiſhed and diverſified by the Original Text; but much more plainly by your own Tranſlations, for ſo you read it, *ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and other ſome Evangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors and Doctors:* and yet more plainly in the parallel place, 1 *Cor.* 12. to which we are referred by your Vulgar Tranſlation, *God hath ſet ſome in the Church, firſt Apoſtles, ſecondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers,* therefore this ſubterfuge is ſtopped againſt you. Obj. But *how can they, which died in the firſt Age, keep us in Unity, and guard us from Error, that live now, perhaps in the laſt? This ſeems to be all one, as if a Man ſhould ſay, that* Alexander, *or* Julius Cæſar *ſhould quiet a mutiny in the King of* Spains *Army. Anſ.* I hope you will grant, that *Hippocrates,* and *Galen,* and *Euclid,* and *Ariſtotle,* and *Saluſt,* and Cæſar, and *Livie,* were dead many Ages ſince; and yet that we are now preſerved from Error by them, in a great part of Phyſick, of Geometry, of Logick, of the *Roman* ſtory. But what if theſe men had writ by divine Inſpiration, and writ compleat bodies of the Sciences they profeſſed, and writ them plainly and perſpicuouſly? You would then have granted, I believe, that their works had been ſufficient to keep us from error, and from diſſention in theſe matters. And why then ſhould it be incongruous to ſay, that the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Paſtors, and Doctors, which Chriſt gave upon his Aſcenſion, by their writings,

which

which ſome of them writ but all approved, are even now ſufficient means, to conſerve us in Unity of Faith, and guard us from Error? Eſpecially ſeeing theſe writings are, by the confeſſion of all parts, true and divine, and as we pretend and are ready to prove, contain a plain and perfect Rule of Faith; and as the * Chiefeſt of you acknowledge, *contain immediatly, all the Principal and Fundamental points of Chriſtianity*, referring us to the Church and Tradition only for ſome minute particularities. But tell me I pray, the Biſhops that compoſed the Decrees of the Council of *Trent*, and the Pope that confirmed them, are they means to conſerve you in Unity, and keep you from Error, or are they not? Peradventure you will ſay, *their Decrees are, but not their Perſons:* but you will not deny I hope, that you owe your unity, and freedom from Error, to the Perſons that made theſe Decrees: neither will you deny, that the writings which they have left behind them, are ſufficient for this purpoſe. And why may not then the Apoſtles writings be as fit for ſuch a purpoſe, as the Decrees of your Doctors? Surely their intent in writing was to conſerve us in unity of Faith, and to keep us from Error, and we are ſure God ſpake in them; but your Doctors from whence they are, we are not ſo certain. Was the Holy Ghoſt then unwilling, or unable to direct them ſo, that their writings ſhould be fit and ſufficient to attain that end they aimed at in writing? For if he were both able and willing to do ſo, then certainly he did do ſo. And then their writings may be very ſufficient means, if we would uſe them as we ſhould do, to preſerve us in unity, in all neceſſary points of Faith, and to guard us from all pernitious Error.

* *Perron.*

81. If yet you be not ſatisfied, but will ſtill pretend that, *all theſe words by you cited, ſeem clearly enough to prove, that the Church is Univerſally infallible, without which Unity of Faith could not be conſerved againſt every wind of Doctrin:* I *Anſ.* That to you, which will not underſtand, that there can be any means to conſerve the unity of Faith, but only that which conſerves your authority over the Faithful, it is no marvel that theſe words ſeem to prove, that the

Church, nay that your Church is univerſally Infallible. But we that have no ſuch end, no ſuch deſires, but are willing to leave all men to their liberty, provided they will not improve it to a Tyranny over others, we find it no difficulty to diſcern between *dedit* and *promiſit*, *he gave at his Aſcenſion*, and *he promiſed to the Worlds end.* Beſides, though you whom it concerns, may happily flatter your ſelves, that you have not only Paſtors, and Doctors, but Prophets, and Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts, and thoſe diſtinct from the former ſtill in your Church; yet we that are diſintereſſed perſons, cannot but ſmile at theſe ſtrange imaginations. Laſtly, though you are apt to think your ſelves ſuch neceſſary inſtruments for all good purpoſes, and that nothing can be well done unleſs you do it; that no unity or conſtancy in Religion can be maintained, but inevitably Chriſtendom muſt fall to ruin, and confuſion, unleſs you ſupport it: yet we that are indifferent and impartial, and well content, that God ſhould give us his own favours, by means of his own appointment, not of our chooſing, can eaſily collect out of theſe very words, that not the Infallibility of your, or of any Church, but the *Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts*, &c. *which Chriſt gave upon his Aſcenſion*, were deſigned by him, for the compaſſing all theſe excellent purpoſes, by their preaching while they lived, and by their writings for ever. And if they fail hereof, the Reaſon is not any inſufficiency or invalidity in the means, but the voluntary perverſneſs of the Subjects they have to deal with: who, if they would be themſelves, and be content that others ſhould be, in the choice of their Religion the ſervants of God and not of men; if they would allow, that the way to Heaven is no narrower now, than Chriſt left it, his yoak no heavier than he made it; that the belief of no more difficulties, is required now to Salvation, than was in the Primitive Church; that no Error is in it ſelf deſtructive, and excluſive from Salvation now, which was not then; if inſtead of being zealous *Papiſts*, earneſt *Calviniſts*, rigid *Lutherans*, they would become themſelves, and be content that others ſhould be plain and honeſt Chriſtians;

if

if all men would believe the Scripture, and freeing themſelves from prejudice and paſſion, would ſincerely endeavour to find the true ſenſe of it, and live according to it, and require no more of others, but to do ſo; nor denying their Communion to any that do ſo, would ſo order their publick ſervice of God, that all which do ſo may without ſcruple, or hypocriſie, or proteſtation againſt any part of it, joyn with them in it: who does not ſee that (ſeeing as we ſuppoſe here, and ſhall prove hereafter,) all neceſſary Truths, are plainly and evidently ſet down in Scripture, there would of neceſſity be among all men, in all things neceſſary, unity of Opinion? And notwithſtanding any other differences that are or could be, unity of Communion and Charity and mutual Toleration? By which means, all Schiſm and Hereſie, would be baniſhed the World, and thoſe wretched contentions which now rend and tear in pieces, not the Coat, but the Members and Bowels of Chriſt, which mutual pride and Tyranny, and curſing, and killing, and damning, would fain make immortal, ſhould ſpeedily receive a moſt bleſſed Cataſtrophe. But of this hereafter, when we ſhall come to the queſtion of Schiſm, wherein I perſwade my ſelf, that I ſhall plainly ſhew, that the moſt vehement accuſers, are the greateſt offenders, and that they are indeed at this time, the greateſt Schiſmaticks, who make the way to Heaven narrower, the yoak of Chriſt heavier, the differences of Faith greater, the conditions of Eccleſiaſtical Communion harder, and ſtricter, than they were made at the beginning by Chriſt and his Apoſtles: they who talk of Unity, but aim at Tyranny, and will have peace with none, but with Slaves and Vaſſals. In the mean while, though I have ſhewed how Unity of Faith, and Unity of Charity too, may be preſerved without your Churches Infallibility, yet ſeeing you modeſtly conclude from hence, not that your Church is, but only *ſeems to be* univerſally Infallible, meaning to your ſelf, of which you are a better judge than I: Therefore I willingly grant your concluſion, and proceed.

86. As

86. As for your pretence, That *to find the meaning of those places, you confer divers Texts, you consult Originals, you examin Translations, and use all the means by Protestants appointed,* I have told you before, that all this is vain and hypocritical, if (as your manner and your doctrin is) you give not your self liberty of judgment in the use of these means; if you make not your selves Judges of, but only Advocates for the doctrin of your Church, refusing to see what these means shew you, if it any way make against the doctrin of your Church, though it be as clear as the light at noon. Remove prejudice, even the ballance, and hold it even, make it indifferent to you which way you go to heaven, so you go the true, which Religion be true so you be of it, then use the means and pray for Gods assistance, and as sure as God is true, you shall be lead into all necessary Truth.

88. Whereas you say, that *it were great impiety to imagin that God, the lover of Souls, hath left no certain infallible means to decide both this and all other differences arising about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occasion:* I desire you to take heed, you commit not an impiety in making more impieties than Gods Commandments make. Certainly God is no way obliged either by his promise or his love to give us all things, that we may imagine would be convenient for us, as formerly I have proved at large. It is sufficient that he denies us nothing necessary to Salvation. *Deus non deficit in necessariis, nec redundat in superfluis:* So D. *Stapleton.* But that the ending of all Controversies, or having a certain means of ending them, is necessary to Salvation, that you have often said and supposed, but never proved, though it be the main pillar of your whole discourse. So little care you take how slight your foundations are, so your building make a fair show. And as little care, how you commit those faults your self, which you condem in others. For you here charge them with great impiety, who imagine that *God the lover of Souls hath left no infallible means to determine all differences arising about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occasion:* And yet afterwards being demanded by D. *Potter, why the Questions*

ſtions between the Jeſuits and Dominicans remain undetermined? You return him this croſs interrogatory, *Who hath aſſured you that the point wherein theſe learned men differ, is a revealed Truth, or capable of definition, or is not rather by plain Scripture indeterminable, or by any Rule of Faith?* So then when you ſay, *it were great impiety to imagine that God hath not left infallible means to decide all differences*; I may anſwer, It ſeems you do not believe your ſelf. For in this controverſie, which is of as high conſequence as any can be, you ſeem to be doubtful whether there be any means to determin it. On the other ſide, when you ask D. *Potter, who aſſured him that there is any means to determine this Controverſie?* I anſwer for him, that you have, in calling *it a great impiety to imagine that there is not ſome infallible means to decide this and all other differences ariſing about the Interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occaſion.* For what trick you can deviſe to ſhew that this difference, between the *Dominicans* and *Jeſuits*, which includes a difference about the ſenſe of many Texts of Scripture, and many other matters of moment, was not included under *this and all other differences*, I cannot imagine. Yet if you can find out any, thus much at leaſt we ſhall gain by it, *that general ſpeeches are not always to be underſtood generally, but ſometimes with exceptions and limitations.*

89. But if there be any infallible means to decide all differences, I beſeech you name them. *You ſay it is to conſult and hear Gods Viſible Church with ſubmiſſive acknowledgment of her Infallibility.* But ſuppoſe the difference be (as here it is) *whether your Church be Infallible*, what ſhall decide that? If you would ſay (as you ſhould do) Scripture and Reaſon, then you foreſee that you ſhould be forced to grant that theſe are fit means to decide this Controverſie, and therefore may be as fit to decide others. Therefore to avoid this, you run into a moſt ridiculous abſurdity, and tell us that this difference alſo, whether the Church be Infallible, as well as others, muſt be agreed by *a ſubmiſſive acknowledgment of the Churches Infallibility.* As if you ſhould have ſaid, My Brethren, I perceive this is a great contention amongſt you, whether the *Roman* Church be

be Infallible? If you will follow my advice, I will ſhew you a ready means to end it; you muſt firſt agree that the *Roman* Church is Infallible, and then your contention whether the *Roman* Church be Infallible, will quickly be at an end. Verily a moſt excellent advice, and moſt compendious way of ending all Controverſies, even without troubling the Church to determine them! For why may not you ſay in all other differences, as you have done in this? Agree that the *Pope* is ſupream head of the Church: That the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine in the Sacrament is turned into the body, and blood of Chriſt: That the Communion is to be given to Lay-men but in one kind: That Pictures may be worſhipped: That Saints are to be invocated; and ſo in the reſt, and then your differences about the Popes Supremacy, Tranſubſtantiation, and all the reſt will ſpeedily be ended. If you ſay, the advice is good in this, but not in other caſes, I muſt requeſt you not to expect always, to be believed upon your word, but to ſhew us ſome reaſon, why any one thing, namely the Churches Infallibility, is fit to prove it ſelf; and any other thing, by name the Popes Supremacy, or Tranſubſtantiation is not as fit? Or if for ſhame you will at length confeſs, that the Churches Infallibility is not fit to decide this difference, whether the Church be infallible, then you muſt confeſs it is not fit to decide all: Unleſs you will ſay, it may be fit to decide all, and yet not fit to decide this, or pretend that this is not comprehended under all. Beſides if you grant that your Churches infallibility cannot poſſibly be well grounded upon, or decided by it ſelf, then having profeſſed before, that *there is no poſſible means beſides this, for us to agree hereupon,* I hope you will give me leave to conclude, that it is impoſſible upon good ground for us to agree that the *Roman* Church is Infallible. For certainly light it ſelf, is not more clear than the evidence of this ſyllogiſm: If there be no other means to make men agree upon your Churches Infallibility, but only this, and this be no means, then it is ſimply impoſſible for men upon good grounds to agree that your Church is Infallible: But there is (as you have granted) no other poſ-

ſible

ſible means to make men agree hereupon, but only a ſubmiſſive acknowledgment of her Infallibility, And this is apparently no means; Therefore it is ſimply impoſſible for men upon good grounds to agree that your Church is Infallible.

90. Laſtly to the place of S. *Auſtin, wherein we are adviſed to follow the way of Catholick Diſcipline, which from Chriſt himſelf by the Apoſtles hath come down even to us, and from us ſhall deſcend to all poſterity:* I anſwer, That the way which S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of, and the way which you commend, being divers ways, and in many things clean contrary, we cannot poſſibly follow them both; and therefore for you to apply the ſame words to them is a vain equivocation. Shew us any way, and do not ſay, but prove it *to have come from Chriſt and his Apoſtles down to us*; and we are ready to follow it. Neither do we expect demonſtration hereof, but ſuch reaſons as may make this more probable than the contrary. But if you bring in things into your now Catholick Diſcipline, which Chriſtians in S. *Auſtins* time held abominable, (as the Picturing of God,) and which you muſt confeſs to have come into the Church Seven Hundred Years after Chriſt: if you will bring in things, as you have done the half Communion, with a *non-obſtante, notwithſtanding Chriſt Inſtitution, and the practice of the Primitive Church were to the contrary:* If you will do ſuch things as theſe, and yet would have us believe, that your whole Religion came from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, this we conceive a requeſt too unreaſonable for modeſt men to make, or for wiſe Men to grant.

CHAP. IV.

The ANSWER to the Fourth CHAPTER.

Wherein is ſhewed, that the Creed contains all neceſſary points of meer Belief.

AD §. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.] Concerning the Creeds containing the Fundamentals of Chriſtiany, this is D. *Potters* aſſertion, delivered in the 207. p. of his Book. *The Creed of the Apoſtles (as it is explained in the latter Creeds of the Catholick Church) is eſteemed a ſufficient ſummary or Catalogue of Fundamentals, by the beſt learned Romaniſts and by Antiquity.*

2. By *Fundamentals* he underſtands *not the Fundamental rules of good Life and Action*, (though every one of theſe is to be believed to come from God, and therefore virtually includes an Article of Faith;) but the Fundamental *Doctrines of Faith*; ſuch, as though they have influence upon our lives, as every eſſential Doctrine of Chriſtianity hath, yet we are commanded to believe them, and not to do them. The aſſent of our underſtandings is required to them, but no obedience from our wills.

3. But theſe ſpeculative Doctrines again he diſtinguiſhes out of *Aquinas*, *Occham*, and *Canus* and others, into two kinds: of the firſt are thoſe which are the *Objects of Faith, in, and for themſelves*, which by their own nature and Gods prime intention, are eſſential parts of that Goſpel: ſuch as the Teachers in the Church, cannot without Mortal ſin omit to teach the Learners: ſuch as are intrinſecal to the Covenant between God and Man; and not only plainly revealed by God, and ſo *certain* truths, but alſo commanded to be preacht to all men, and to be believed diſtinctly by all, and ſo *neceſſary truths*. Of the ſecond ſort are *Accidental*, *Circumſtantial*, *Occaſional* objects of Faith; Millions whereof there are in Holy Scripture; ſuch as are to be believed, not for themſelves, but

but becauſe they are joyned with others, that are neceſſary to be believed, and delivered by the ſame Authority which delivered theſe. Such as we are not bound to know to be Divine Revelations, (for without any fault we may be Ignorant hereof, nay believe the contrary;) ſuch as we are not bound to examine, whether or no they be Divine Revelations: ſuch as Paſtors are not bound to teach their Flock, nor their Flock bound to know and remember: no nor the Paſtors themſelves to know them, or believe them, or not to disbelieve them abſolutely and always; but then only when they do ſee, and know them to be delivered in Scripture, as Divine Revelations.

4. I ſay when they do ſo, and not only when they may do. For to lay an obligation upon us of believing, or not disbelieving any Verity, ſufficient Revelation on Gods part, is not ſufficient: For then ſeeing all the expreſs Verities of Scripture are either to all men, or at leaſt to all learned men ſufficiently revealed by God, it ſhould be a damnable ſin, in any learned men actually to disbelieve any one particular Hiſtorical verity contained in Scripture, or to believe the contradiction of it, though he knew it not to be there contained. For though he did not, yet he might have known it; it being plainly revealed by God, and this revelation being extant in ſuch a Book, wherein he might have found it recorded, if with dilligence he had peruſed it. To make therefore any points neceſſary to be believed, it is requiſite, that either we actually know them to be Divine Revelations: and theſe though they be not Articles of Faith, nor neceſſary to be believed, in and for themſelves, yet indirectly, and by accident, and by conſequence, they are ſo: The neceſſity of believing them, being inforced upon us, by a neceſſity of believing this Eſſential, and Fundamental Article of Faith, *That all Divine Revelations are true*, which to disbelieve, or not to believe, is for any Chriſtian not only impious, but impoſſible. Or elſe it is requiſite that they be, Firſt actually revealed by God. Secondly, commanded under pain of damnation, to be

particularly known (I mean known to be Divine Revelations,) and diſtinctly to be believed. And of this latter ſort of ſpeculative Divine Verities, *D. Potter* affirmed, *that the Apoſtles Creed was a ſufficient ſummary:* yet he affirmed it, not as his own opinion, but as the Doctrine of the *Ancient Fathers, and your own Doctors.* And beſides, he affirmed it not as abſolutely certain, but very probable.

5. In brief, all that he ſays is this: It is *very probable, that according to the judgment of the* Roman *Doctors, and the Ancient Fathers, the Apoſtles Creed is to be eſteemed a ſufficient ſummary of all thoſe Doctrines which being meerly* Credenda, *and not* Agenda, *all men are ordinarily, under pain of Damnation, bound particularly to believe.*

6. Now *this aſſertion* (you ſay) *is neither pertinent to the queſtion in hand, nor in it ſelf true.* Your Reaſons to prove it *impertinent*, put into form and diveſted of impertinencies are theſe. 1. *Becauſe the queſtion was not, what points were neceſſary to be explicitely believed, but what points were neceſſary not to be disbelieeved after ſufficient propoſal. And therefore to give a Catalogue of points, neceſſary to be explicitely believed is impertinent.*

7. *Secondly, becauſe Errors may be damnable, though the contrary truths be not of themſelves Fundamental; as that* Pontius Pilate *was our Saviours Judge, is not in it ſelf a Fundamental truth, yet to believe the contrary were a damnable Error. And therefore to give a Catalogue of Truths in themſelves Fundamental, is no pertinent ſatisfaction to this demand, what Errors are damnable?*

8. *Thirdly, becauſe if the Church be not Univerſally infallible, we cannot ground any certainty upon the Creed, which we muſt receive upon the Credit of the Church: and if the Church be Univerſally Infallible, it is damnable to oppoſe her declaration in any thing, though not contained in the Creed.*

9. *Fourthly, Becauſe not to believe the Articles of the Creed in the true ſenſe is damnable, therefore it is frivolous to ſay the Creed contains all Fundamentals, without ſpecifying in what ſenſe the Articles of it are Fundamental.*

10. *Fifthly, becauſe the Apoſtles Creed (as D.* Potter *himſelf confeſſes) was not a ſufficient Catalogue, till it was explained by*

by the firſt Council; nor then until it was declared in the ſecond, &c. by occaſion of emergent Hereſies: Therefore now alſo as new Hereſies may ariſe, it will need particular explanation, and ſo is not yet, nor ever will be a compleat Catalogue of Fundamentals.

11. Now to the firſt of theſe objections I ſay: Firſt, that your diſtinction between points neceſſary to be believed, and neceſſary not to be disbelieved, is more ſubtil than ſound, a diſtinction without a difference: There being no point neceſſary to be believed, which is not neceſſary not to be disbelieved: Nor no point to any man, at any time, in any circumſtances neceſſary not to be disbelieved, but it is to the ſame man, at the ſame time, in the ſame circumſtances, neceſſary to be believed. Yet that which (I believe) you would have ſaid, I acknowledge true, that many points which are not neceſſary to be believed abſolutely, are yet neceſſary to be believed upon a ſuppoſition, that they are known to be revealed by God: that is, become then neceſſary to be believed, when they are known to be Divine Revelations. But then I muſt needs ſay, you do very ſtrangly, in ſaying, that *the queſtion was, what points might lawfully be disbelieved, after ſufficient Propoſition that they are Divine Revelations.* You affirm, that none may, and ſo does *D. Potter*, and with him all Proteſtants, and all Chriſtians. And how then is this the queſtion? Who ever ſaid or thought, that of Divine Revelations, known to be ſo, ſome might ſafely and lawfully be rejected, and disbelieved, under pretence that they are not Fundamental? which of us ever taught, that it was not damnable, either to deny, or ſo much as doubt of the Truth of any thing, whereof we either know, or believe that God hath revealed it? What Proteſtant ever taught that it was not damnable, either to give God the lie, or to call his Veracity into queſtion? Yet you ſay, *The demand of Charity miſtaken was, and it was moſt reaſonable, that a liſt of Fundamentals, ſhould be given, the denial whereof deſtroys Salvation, whereas the denial of other points may ſtand with Salvation, although both kinds be equally propoſed, as revealed by God.*

12. Let

12. Let the reader peruſe *Charity Miſtaken*, and he ſhall find that this qualification, *although both kinds of points be equally propoſed as revealed by God*, is your addition, atd no part of the demand. And if it had, it had been moſt unreaſonable, ſeeing he and you know well enough, that (though we do not preſently without examination, fall down and worſhip all your Churches propoſals, as Divine Revelations) yet, we make no ſuch diſtinction of known Divine Revelations, as if ſome only of them were neceſſary to be believed, and the reſt might ſafely be rejected. So that to demand a particular minute Catalogue of all points that may not be disbelieved after ſufficient Propoſition, is indeed to demand a Catalogue of all points that are or may be, in as much as none may be disbelieved, after ſufficient Propoſition, that it is a Divine Revelation. At leaſt it is to deſire us, Frſt, to Tranſcribe into this Catalogue, every Text of the whole Bible. Secondly, to ſet down diſtinctly, thoſe innumerous Millions of negative and poſitive conſequences, which may be evidently deduced from it: For theſe we ſay, God hath revealed. And indeed you are not aſhamed in plain terms to require this of us. For having firſt told us, *that the demand was, what points were neceſſary not to be disbelieved, after ſufficient propoſition that they are Divine Truths*: you come to ſay, *Certainly the Creed contains not all theſe.* And this you prove by asking, *how many Truths are there in Holy Scripture, not contained in the Creed, which we are not bound to know and believe, but are bound under pain of damnation not to reject, as ſoon as we come to know that they are found in Holy Scripture?* So that in requiring a particular Catalogue of all points, not to be disbelieved, after ſufficient Propoſal, you require us to ſet you down all points contained in Scripture, or evidently deducible from it. And yet this you are pleaſed to call a *reaſonable*, nay, *a moſt reaſonable Demand*: whereas having ingaged your ſelf to give a Catalogue of your Fundamentals, you conceive your engagement very well ſatisfied by ſaying, *all is Fundamental which the Church propoſes*, without going about, to give us

an

an endleſs Inventory of her Propoſals. And therefore from us, inſtead of a perfect particular of Divine Revelations of all ſorts, (of which with a leſs hyperbole than S. *John* uſeth, we might ſay, *If they were to be written, the World would not hold the Books that muſt be written*;) methinks you ſhould accept of this general, All Divine Revelations are true, and to be believed.

13. The very truth is, the main Queſtion in this buſineſs is not, *what Divine Revelations are neceßary to be believed, or not rejected when they are ſufficiently propoſed*: for all without exception, all without queſtion are ſo; But *what Revelations are ſimply and abſolutely neceſſary to be propoſed to the belief of Chriſtians, ſo that that Society, which does propoſe, and indeed believe them, hath for matter of Faith, the eſſence of a true Church; that which does not, has not.* Now to this queſtion, though not to yours, *D. Potter's* aſſertion (if it be true) is apparently very pertinent. And though not a full and total ſatisfaction to it, yet very effectual, and of great moment towards it. For the main queſtion being, what points are neceſſary to Salvation: and points neceſſary to Salvation, being of two ſorts, ſome of *ſimple belief*, ſome of *Practice and Obedience*, he that gives you a ſufficient ſummary, of the firſt ſort of neceſſary points, hath brought you half way towards your Journies end. And therefore that which he does, is no more to be ſlighted, as vain and impertinent, than an Architects work is to be thought impertinent towards the making of a Houſe, becauſe he does it not all himſelf. Sure I am, if his aſſertion be true, as I believe it is, a Corollary may preſently be deduced from it, which if it were imbraced, cannot in all reaſon, but do infinite ſervice, both to the truth of Chriſt, and the peace of Chriſtendom. For ſeeing falſhood and Error could not long ſtand againſt the power of truth, were they not ſupported by Tyranny and worldly advantages, he that could aſſert Chriſtians to that liberty which Chriſt and his Apoſtles left them, muſt need do Truth a moſt Heroical ſervice. And ſeeing the overvaluing of the differences among Chriſtians, is one of the greateſt maintainers of the Schiſm

Schiſm of Chriſtendom, he that could demonſtrate that only theſe points of Belief, are ſimply neceſſary to Salvation, wherein Chriſtians generally agree, ſhould he not lay a very fair and firm Foundation of the peace of Chriſtendom? Now the Corollary which I conceive would produce theſe good effects, and which flowes naturally from D. *Potters* Aſſertion, is this, *That what Man or Church ſoever believes the Creed, and all the evident conſequences of it ſincerely and heartily, cannot poſſibly (if alſo he believe the Scripture) be in any Error of ſimple belief which is offenſive to God; nor therefore deſerve for any ſuch Error to be deprived of his Life, or to be cut off from the Churches Communion, and the hope of Salvation.* And the production of this again would be this (which highly concerns the Church of *Rome* to think of,) *That whatſoever Man or Church does for any Error of ſimple belief, deprive any man ſo quallified as above, either of his temporal life, or livelyhood or liberty, or of the Churches Communion, and hope of Salvation, is for the firſt unjuſt, cruel, and Tyrannous: Schiſmatical, preſumptuous, and uncharitable for the ſecond.*

14. Neither yet is this (as you pretend) to take away the neceſſity of believing thoſe Verities of Scripture, which are not contained in the Creed, when once we come to know that they are written in Scripture, but rather to lay a neceſſity upon men of believing all things written in Scripture, when once they know them to be there written. For he that believes not all known Divine Revelations to be true, how does he believe in God? Unleſs you will ſay, that the ſame man, at the ſame time may not believe God, and yet believe in him. The greater difficulty is, how it will not take away the neceſſity of believing Scripture to be the Word of God? But that it will not neither. For though the Creed be granted a ſufficient ſummary of *Articles of meer Faith*, yet no man pretends that it contains the *Rules of Obedience*, but for them, all men are referred to Scripture. Beſides, he that pretends to believe in God, obligeth himſelf to believe it neceſſary to obey that which reaſon aſſures him to be the Will of God. Now reaſon will aſſure him

him that believes the Creed, that it is the Will of God he ſhould believe the Scripture: even the very ſame Reaſon which moves him to believe the Creed: Univerſal, and never failing Tradition, having given this Teſtimony both to Creed and Scripture, that they both by the works of God were ſealed, and teſtified to be the words of God. And thus much be ſpoken in Anſwer to your firſt Argument; the length whereof will be the more excuſable, If I oblige my ſelf to ſay but little to the reſt.

15. I come then *to your ſecond.* And in Anſwer to it, deny flatly, as a thing deſtructive of it ſelf, that any Error can be damnable, unleſs it be repugnant immediatly or mediatly, directly or indirectly, of it ſelf or by accident, to ſome Truth for the matter of it fundamental. And to your example of *Pontius Pilat's being Judge of Chriſt*, I ſay the denial of it in him that knows it to be revealed by God, is manifeſtly deſtructive of this Fundamental truth, that *all Divine Revelations are true.* Neither will you find any Error ſo much as by accident damnable, but the rejecting of it will be neceſſarily laid upon us, by a real belief of all Fundamentals, and ſimply neceſſary Truths. And I deſire you would reconcile with this, that which you have ſaid §.15. *Every Fundamental Error muſt have a contrary Fundamental Truth, becauſe of two Contradictory propoſitions in the ſame degree, the one is falſe, the other muſt be true,* &c.

16. *To the Third* I Anſwer; That the certainty I have of the Creed, That it was from the Apoſtles, and contains the principles of Faith, I ground it not upon Scripture, and yet not upon the Infallibility of any preſent, much leſs of your Church, but upon the Authority of the Ancient Church, and written Tradition, which (as D. *Potter* hath proved) gave this conſtant Teſtimony unto it. Beſides I tell you, it is guilty of the ſame fault which D. *Potter's* Aſſertion is here accuſed of: having perhaps ſome colour toward the proving it falſe, but none at all to ſhew it impertinent.

17. *To the Fourth,* I Anſwer plainly thus, That you find fault with D. *Potter* for his Vertues: you are offended with him for not uſurping the Authority which he hath not; in

a word for not playing the *Pope*. Certainly if *Proteſtants* be faulty in this matter, it is for doing it too much, and not too little. This preſumptuous impoſing of the ſenſes of men upon the words of God, the ſpecial ſenſes of men upon the general words of God, and laying them upon mens conſciences together, under the equal penalty of death, and damnation; this vain conceit that we can ſpeak of the things of God, better than in the word of God: This Deifying our own Interpretations, and Tyrannous inforcing them upon others; This reſtraining of the word of God from that latitude and generality, and the underſtandings of men from that liberty, wherein Chriſt and the Apoſtles left them, [a] is, and hath been the only fountain of all the Schiſms of the Church, and that which makes them immortal: the common incendiary of Chriſtendom, and that which (as I ſaid before) tears into pieces, not the coat, but the bowels, and members of Chriſt: *Ridente Turcâ nec dolente Judæo.* Take away theſe Walls of ſeparation, and all will quickly be one. Take away this *Perſecuting, Burning, Curſing, Damning* of men for not ſubſcribing to the *words of Men*, as the words of God; Require of Chriſtians only to believe Chriſt, and to call no man maſter but him only: Let thoſe leave claiming Infallibility that have no title to it, and let them that in their words diſclaim it, diſclaim it likewiſe in their actions; In a word, take away Tyranny, which is the Devils inſtrument to ſupport errors, and ſuperſtitions, and impieties, in the ſeveral parts of the World, which could not otherwiſe long withſtand the power of Truth, I ſay take away Tyranny, and reſtore Chriſtians to their juſt and full liberty of captivating their underſtanding to Scripture only, and as Rivers when they have a free paſſage, run all to the Ocean, ſo it may well be hoped by Gods bleſſing, that Univerſal Liberty thus moderated, may quickly reduce Chriſtendom to Truth and Unity. Theſe thoughts of peace (I am perſwaded) may come from the God of peace, and to his bleſſing I commend them, and proceed.

18. *Your fifth and laſt objection* ſtands upon a falſe and dangerous ſuppoſition: That *new Hereſies may ariſe.* For an

[a] This perſwaſion is no ſingularity of mine but the Doctrin which I have learnt from Divines of great learning and judgment. Let the Reader be pleaſed to peruſe the ſeaventh book of *Acontius de Stratag. Satanæ.* And *Zanchius* his laſt *Oration* delivered by him after the compoſing of the diſcord between him and *Amerbachius*, and he ſhall confeſs as much.

an Hereſie being in it ſelf nothing elſe but a Doctrine Repugnant to ſome Article of the Chriſtian Faith, to ſay that new Hereſies may ariſe, is to ſay, that new Articles of Faith may ariſe: and ſo ſome great ones among you ſtick not to profeſs in plain terms, who yet at the ſame time are not aſhamed to pretend that your whole Doctrin is Catholick and Apoſtolick. So *Salmeron: Non omnibus omnia dedit Deus, ut quælibet ætas ſuis gaudeat veritatibus, quas prior ætas ignoravit.* God hath not given all things to All: So that every age hath its proper Verities, which the former age was ignorant of: *Diſp.* 57. *In Ep. ad Rom.* And again in the Margent: *Habet Unumquodq; ſæculum peculiares Revelationes Divinas,* Every age hath its peculiar Divine Revelations. Where that he ſpeaks of ſuch Revelations as are, or may by the Church be made matters of Faith, no man can doubt that reads him; an example whereof, he gives us a little before in theſe words. *Unius Auguſtini doctrina Aſſumptionis B. Deiparæ cultum in Eccleſiam introduxit.* The Doctrin of *Auguſtin* only, hath brought in to the Church the Worſhip of the Aſſumption of the Mother of God, *&c.* Others again mince and palliate the matter with this pretence, that your Church undertakes not to coyn new Articles of Faith, but only to declare thoſe that want ſufficient declaration. But if ſufficient declaration be neceſſary to make any Doctrin an Article of Faith, then this Doctrin which before wanted it, was not before an Article of Faith; and your Church by giving it the Eſſential form, and laſt complement of an Article of Faith, makes it, though not a Truth, yet certainly an Article of Faith. But I would fain know, whether Chriſt and his Apoſtles knew this Doctrin, which you pretend hath the matter, but wants the form of an Article of Faith, that is, *ſufficient declaration,* whether they knew it to be a neceſſary Article of the Faith, or no! If they knew it not to be ſo: then either they taught what they knew not, which were very ſtrange; or elſe they taught it not: and if not, I would gladly be informed, ſeeing you pretend to no new Revelations from whom you learnt it? If they knew it, then either they concealed or decla-

red it. To ſay they concealed any neceſſary part of the Goſpel, is to charge them with far greater Sacriledg, than what was puniſhed in *Ananias* and *Saphira*. It is to charge theſe glorious Stewards, and diſpenſers of the Myſteries of Chriſt, with want of the great vertue requiſite in a Steward, which is *Fidelity*. It is to charge them with preſumption for denouncing Anathema's, even to Angels, in caſe they ſhould teach any other doctrin, than what they had received from them, which ſure could not merit an Anathema, if they left any neceſſary part of the Goſpel untaught. It is in a word, in plain terms to give them the lie, ſeeing they profeſs plainly and frequently, that they taught Chriſtians *the whole Doctrin of Chriſt*. If they did know and declare it, then was it a full and formal Article of Faith; and the contrary a full and formal Hereſie, without any need of further declaration: and then their Succeſſors either continued the declaration of it, or diſcontinued: If they did the latter, how are they ſuch faithful depoſitaries of Apoſtolick Doctrin as you pretend? Or what aſſurance can you give us, that they might not bring in new and falſe Articles, as well as ſuffer the old and true ones to be loſt? If they did continue the declaration of it, and deliver it to their Succeſſors, and they to theirs, and ſo on perpetually, then continued it ſtill a full and formal Article of faith, and the repugnant doctrin a full and formal Hereſie, without and before the definition or declaration of a Council. So that Councils, as they cannot make that a truth or falſhood, which before was not ſo: ſo neither can they make or declare that to be an Article of Faith, or an Hereſie, which before was not ſo. The ſuppoſition therefore on which this argument ſtands, being falſe and ruinous, whatſoever is built upon it, muſt together with it fall to the ground. This explication therefore, and reſtriction of this doctrin, (whereof you make your advantage) was to my underſtanding unneceſſary. The Fathers of the Church in after times might have juſt cauſe to declare their judgment, touching the ſenſe of ſome general Articles of the Creed: but to oblige others to receive their declarations under pain of damnation, what warrant they had I know

know not. He that can ſhew, either that the Church of all Ages was to have this Authority; or that it continued in the Church for ſome Ages, and then expired: He that can ſhew either of theſe things let him: for my part I cannot. Yet I willingly confeſs the judgment of a Council, though not infallible, is yet ſo far directive and obliging that without apparent reaſon to the contrary, it may be ſin to reject it, at leaſt not to afford it an outward ſubmiſſion for publick peace ſake.

20. Ad §. 7. 8, 9. I come now to ſhew that you alſo have requited D. *Potter* with a mutual courteous acknowledgment of his aſſertion, That the Creed is a ſufficient ſummary of all the neceſſary Articles of Faith, which are meerly *Credenda*.

21. Firſt then, §. 8. You have theſe words, *That it cannot be denied that the Creed is moſt full and compleat to that purpoſe, for which the holy Apoſtles, inſpired by God, meant that it ſhould ſerve, and in that manner as they did intend it, which was, not to comprehend all particular points of Faith, but ſuch general heads as were moſt befitting and requiſite for preaching the Faith of Chriſt, to Jews and Gentiles, and might be briefly, and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learnt and remembred.* Theſe words I ſay, being fairly examined, without putting them on the rack, will amount, to a full acknowledgment of D. *Potters* Aſſertion. But before I put them to the queſtion, I muſt crave thus much right of you, to grant me this moſt reaſonable poſtulate, that the doctrin of *repentance from dead works*, which S. *Paul* ſaith, was one of the two only things which he preacht, and the doctrin *of Charity, without which* (the ſame S. *Paul* aſſures us that) *the knowledge of all myſteries, and all faith is nothing*, were doctrins more neceſſary and requiſite, and therefore more fit to be preacht to *Jews* and *Gentiles*, than theſe, *under what judge our Saviour ſuffered*, that *he was buried*, and *what time he roſe again*: which you have taught us cap. 3. §. 2. *for their matter and nature in themſelves not to be Fundamental.*

22. And upon this grant, I will ask no leave to conclude, that, whereas you ſay, *the Apoſtles Creed was intended for a comprehenſion, of ſuch heads of faith, as were moſt befitting and*

and requiſite, for preaching the faith of Chriſt, &c. You are now, for fear of too much debaſing thoſe high doctrines as Repentance and Charity, to reſtrain your aſſertion, as D. *Potter* does his, (and though you ſpeak indefinitely) to ſay you meant it, only of thoſe heads of faith, which are *meerly Credenda*. And then the meaning of it, (if it have any,) muſt be this, That the Creed is full for the Apoſtles intent, which was to comprehend all ſuch general heads of faith, which being points of *ſimple belief*, were moſt fit and requiſite, to be preached to Jews and Gentiles, and might be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learned and remembred. Neither I nor you, I believe, can make any other ſence of your words than this. And upon this ground thus I ſubſume. But all the points of belief, which were neceſſary, under pain of damnation, for the Apoſtles to preach, and for thoſe to whom the Goſpel was preached, particularly to know and believe, were moſt fit and requiſite, nay more than ſo, neceſſary to be preached to all both Jews and Gentiles, and might be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſie learn'd and remembred: therefore the Apoſtles intent by your confeſſion, was in this Creed, to comprehend all ſuch points. And you ſay, *the Creed is moſt full and complete, for the purpoſe which they intended*. The Major of this Syllogiſm is your own. The Minor I ſhould think needs no proof, yet becauſe all men may not be of my mind, I will prove it by its parts; and the firſt part thus, There is the ſame neceſſity, for the doing of theſe things, which are commanded to be done, by the ſame Authority, under the ſame penalty: But the ſame Authority, *viz.* Divine, under the ſame penalty, to wit, of damnation, commanded the Apoſtles, to preach all theſe Doctrines which we ſpeak of, and thoſe to whom they were preached, particularly to know and believe them: For we ſpeak of thoſe only, which were ſo commanded, to be preached and believed: Therefore all theſe points were alike neceſſary to be preached to all both Jews and Gentiles. Now that all theſe doctrines we ſpeak of, may be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learned and remembred, he that remembers, that we ſpake only

only of ſuch Doctrines as are neceſſary to be taught and learned, will require hereof no farther demonſtration. For, (not to put you in mind of what the Poet ſays, *Non ſunt longa quibus nihil eſt quod demere poſſis,*) who ſees not, that ſeeing the greateſt part of men are of very mean capacities, that it is neceſſary that that may be learnt eaſily, which is to be learn'd of all? What then can hinder me from concluding thus, all the Articles of ſimple belief, which are fit and requiſite to be preached, and may eaſily be remembred, are by your confeſſion comprized in the Creed: but all the neceſſary Articles of Faith are requiſite to be preached, and eaſie to be remembred; therefore they are all comprized in the Creed? Secondly, from grounds granted by you, I argue thus, Points of belief in themſelves fundamental, are more requiſite to be preached than thoſe which are not ſo: (this is evident.) But the Apoſtles have put into their Creed ſome points that are not in themſelves fundamental: (ſo you confeſs, *ubi ſupra.*) Therefore if they have put in all, moſt requiſite to be preached, they have put in all, that in themſelves are fundamental. Thirdly and laſtly, from your own words Sect. 26. thus I conclude my purpoſe, *The Apoſtles intention was, particularly to deliver in the Creed ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times, concerning the Deity, Trinity, and Meſſias*; (thus you, now I ſubſume,) but all points ſimply neceſſary, by vertue of Gods command, to be preached and believed in particular, were as fit for thoſe times as theſe here mentioned; therefore their intention was, to deliver in it particularly all the neceſſary points of belief.

23. And certainly he that conſiders the matter adviſedly, either muſt ſay that the Apoſtles were not the Authors of it, or that this was their deſign in compoſing it, or that they had none at all. For whereas you ſay, *their intent was, to comprehend in it ſuch general heads as were moſt befitting and requiſite for preaching the faith*; and elſewhere, *Particularly to deliver ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times*; Every wiſe man may eaſily ſee that your deſire here was, to eſcape away in a cloud of indefinite terms. For otherwiſe, inſtead of ſuch general heads, and ſuch Articles,

Why

why did not you ſay plainly, all ſuch, or ſome ſuch? This had been plain dealing, but I fear, croſs to your deſign: which yet you have failed of. For that which you have ſpoken (though you are loath to ſpeak out,) either ſignifies nothing at all; or that which I and D. *Porter* affirm: *viz.* That the Apoſtles Creed contains all thoſe points of belief, which were by Gods command, of neceſſity to be preached to all, and believed by all. Neither when I ſay ſo, would I be ſo miſtaken, as if I ſaid, that all points in the Creed are thus neceſſary: For Punies in Logick, know that univerſal affirmatives, are not ſimply converted. And therefore it may be true, that all ſuch neceſſary points, are in the Creed; though it be not true, that all points in the Creed are thus neceſſary: which I willingly grant, of the points by you mentioned. But this rather confirms, than any way invalidates my aſſertion. For how could it ſtand with the Apoſtles wiſdom, to put in any points circumſtantial and not neceſſary, and at the ſame time, to leave out any that were eſſential and neceſſary for that end, which you ſay they propoſed to themſelves, in making the Creed, that is, *The preaching of the Faith, to Jews and Gentiles?*

31. Ad §.11.12,13,14,15. Obj. *Summaries and Abſtracts are not intended to ſpecifie all the particulars of the ſcience or ſubject to which they belong.*

Anſ. Yes if they be intended for perfect Summaries, they muſt not omit any neceſſary doctrin of that Science whereof they are Summaries; though the Illuſtration and Reaſons of it they may omit. If this were not ſo, a man might ſet down forty or fifty of the Principal definitions and diviſions, and rules of Logick, and call it a Summary or Abſtract of Logick. But ſure, this were no more a Summary, than that were the picture of a man in little, that wanted any of the parts of a man; or that a total ſum wherein all the particulars were not caſt up. Now the Apoſtles Creed you here intimate that it was intended for a Summary: otherwiſe why talk you here of Sūmaries, and tell us that they need not contain all the particulars of their Science? And of what I pray may it be a Sum-

Summary, but of the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Faith? Now you have already told us, *That it is moſt full and compleat to that purpoſe for which it was intended.* Lay all this together, and I believe the product will be; That the Apoſtles Creed is a perfect Summary of the Fundamentals of the Chriſtian Faith: and what the duty of a perfect Summary is, I have already told you.

32. Whereas therefore to diſprove this Aſſertion, in divers particles of this Chapter, but eſpecially the Fourteenth, you muſter up whole Armies of Doctrines, which you pretend are neceſſary, and not contained in the Creed; I anſwer very briefly thus: That the Doctrines you mention, are either concerning matters of practice, and not ſimple belief; or elſe they are ſuch Doctrines wherein God has not ſo plainly revealed himſelf, but that honeſt and good men, true Lovers of God and of Truth, thoſe that deſire above all things to know his will and do it, may Err, and yet commit no ſin at all, or only a ſin of infirmity, and not deſtructive of Salvation; or laſtly, they are ſuch Doctrines which God hath plainly revealed, and ſo are neceſſary to be believed when they are known to be Divine, but not neceſſary to be known and believed, not neceſſary to be known for Divine, that they may be believed. Now all theſe ſorts of Doctrines are impertinent to the preſent Queſtion.

33. Firſt, the Queſtions touching the Conditions to be performed by us to obtain remiſſion of ſins; the Sacraments; the Commandments, and the poſſibility of keeping them, the neceſſity of imploring the Aſſiſtance of Gods Grace and Spirit for the keeping of them: how far obedience is due to the Church: Prayer for the Dead: The ceſſation of the Old Law: are all about *Agenda*, and ſo cut off upon the firſt conſideration.

34. Secondly, the Queſtion touching Fundamentals, is profitable but not Fundamental. He that believes all Fundamentals, cannot be damned for any Error in Faith, though he believe more or leſs to be Fundamental than is ſo. That alſo of the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son: of Purgatory: of the Churches

Viſibility: of the Books of the *New Teſtament* which were doubted of by a conſiderable part of the Primitive Church: (until I ſee better reaſon for the contrary than the bare authority of men,) I ſhall eſteem of the ſame condition.

35. Thirdly, Theſe Doctrines that *Adam* and the Angels ſinned: that there are Angels good and bad: that thoſe Books of Scripture which were never doubted of by any conſiderable part of the Church, are the word of God: that S. *Peter* had no ſuch primacy as you pretend: that the Scripture is a perfect rule of Faith, aad conſequently that no neceſſary Doctrine is unwritten: that there is no one Society or ſucceſſion of Chriſtians abſolutely Infallible: Theſe to my underſtanding are truths plainly revealed by God, and neceſſary to be believed by them who know they are ſo. But not ſo neceſſary, that every Man and Woman is bound under pain of damnation particularly to know them to be Divine Revelations, and explicitely to believe them. And for this reaſon, theſe with innumerable other points, are to be referred to the third ſort of Doctrines above mentioned, which were never pretended to have place in the Creed. There remains one only point of all that Army you Muſtred together, reducible to none of theſe Heads, and that is, that God is, and is a Remunerator, which you ſay is queſtioned by the denial of merit. But if there were ſuch a neceſſary indiſſoluble coherence between this point and the Doctrine of merit, methinks with as much reaſon, and more charity you might conclude, That we hold merit, becauſe we hold this point; Then that we deny this point, becauſe we deny merit. Beſide, when *Proteſtants* deny the Doctrine of Merits, you know right well, for ſo they have declared themſelves a thouſand times, that they mean nothing elſe, but with *David*, that *their well doing extendeth not, is not truly beneficial to God*: with our Saviour, *when they have done all which they are commanded, they have done their duty only*, and no courteſie: And laſtly, with S. *Paul*, that *all which they can ſuffer for God* (and yet ſuffering is more than doing) *is not worthy to be compared*

pared to the glory that ſhall be revealed. So that you muſt either miſunderſtand their meaning in denying Merit, or you muſt diſcharge their Doctrine of this odious conſequence, or you muſt charge it upon *David* and *Paul* and *Chriſt* himſelf. Nay you muſt either grant their denial of true Merit juſt and reaſonable, or you muſt ſay, that our good actions are really profitable to God: that they are not debts already due to him, but voluntary and undeſerved Favours: and that they are equal unto and well worthy of Eternal Glory which is prepared for them. As for the inconvenience which you ſo much fear, That the denial of Merit makes God a giver only, and not a rewarder; I tell you, good Sir, you fear where no fear is, and that it is both moſt true on the one ſide, that you in holding good Works meritorious of Eternal Glory make God a rewarder only and not a giver, contrary to plain Scripture, affirming that *The gift of God is Eternal Life*; And that it is moſt falſe on the other ſide, that the Doctrine of *Proteſtants* makes God a giver only and not a rewarder: In as much as their Doctrine is, That God gives not Heaven but to thoſe which do ſomething for it, and ſo his gift is alſo a Reward; but withal that whatſoever they do is due unto God beforehand, and worth nothing to God, and worth nothing in reſpect of Heaven, and ſo Mans work is no Merit, and Gods reward is ſtill a Gift.

36. Put the caſe the *Pope*, for a reward of your Service done him in writing this Book, had given you the Honour and means of a Cardinal, would you not, not only in humility but in ſincerity have profeſſed, that you had not merited ſuch a reward? And yet the *Pope* is neither your Creator nor Redeemer, nor Preſerver, nor perhaps your very great Benefactor, ſure I am, not ſo great as God Almighty, and therefore hath no ſuch right and title to your Service as God hath in reſpect of precedent obligations. Beſides, the work you have done him hath been really advantagious to him: and laſtly, not altogether unproportionable to the forementioned reward. And therefore if by the ſame work you will pretend that either you have or hope to have deſerved immortal

Happineſs, I beſeech you conſider well whether this be not to ſet a higher value upon a Cardinals Cap, than a Crown of immortal Glory, and with that Cardinal to prefer a part in *Paris* before a part in *Paradiſe*.

37. As for your diſtinction, between Hereſies that have been, and Hereſies that are, and Hereſies that may be, I have already proved it vain; and that whatſoever may be an Hereſie, that is ſo; and whatſoever is ſo, that always hath been ſo, ever ſince the publication of the Goſpel of Chriſt. The Doctrine of your Church may like a Snow-ball increaſe with rouling, and again if you pleaſe melt away and decreaſe: But as *Chriſt Jeſus*, ſo his Goſpel, *is yeſterday and to day, and the ſame for ever.*

38. Our Saviour ſending his Apoſtles to preach, gave them no other Commiſſion than this: *Go teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, teaching them to obſerve all things, whatſoever I have commanded you.* Theſe were the bounds of their Commiſſion. If your Church have any larger, or if ſhe have a Commiſſion at large, to teach what ſhe pleaſes, and call it the Goſpel of Chriſt, let her produce her Letters patents, from Heaven for it. But if this be all you have, then muſt you give me leave to eſteem it both great ſacriledg in you to forbid any thing, be it never ſo ſmall or ceremonious, which Chriſt hath commanded: as the receiving of the Communion in both kinds: and as high a degree of preſumption, to enjoyn men to believe, that there are or can be any other Fundamental Articles of the Goſpel of Chriſt, than what Chriſt himſelf commanded his Apoſtles to teach all men; or any damnable Hereſies, but ſuch as are plainly repugnant to theſe prime Verities.

39. Ad §. 16, 17.] The ſaying of the moſt Learned *Prelate* and excellent man the *Arch-Biſhop* of *Armach* (which ſhall be ſet down at the end of *N.* 43.) is as great and as good a Truth, and as neceſſary for theſe miſerable times as can poſſibly be uttered: For this is moſt certain, and I believe you will eaſily grant it, that to reduce Chriſtians to Unity of Communion, there are but two ways

tha

that may be conceived probable: The one, by taking away diverſity of opinions touching matters of Religion: The other by ſhewing that the diverſity of Opinions, which is among the ſeveral Sects of Chriſtians, ought to be no hindrance to their Unity in Communion.

40. Now the former of theſe is not to be hoped for without a miracle, unleſs that could be done, which is impoſſible to be performed, though it be often pretended; that is, unleſs it could be made evident to all men, that God hath appointed ſome viſible Judge of Controverſies, to whoſe judgment all men are to ſubmit themſelves. What then remains, but that the other way muſt be taken, and Chriſtians muſt be taught to ſet a higher value upon theſe high points of Faith and obedience wherein they agree, than upon theſe matters of leſs moment wherein they differ, and underſtand that agreement in thoſe, ought to be more effectual to joyn them in one Communion, than their difference in other things of leſs moment to divide them? When I ſay, *in one Communion*, I mean, in a common Profeſſion of thoſe articles of Faith, wherein all conſent: A joynt worſhip of God, after ſuch a way as all eſteem lawful; and a mutual performance of all thoſe works of Charity, which Chriſtians owe one to another. And to ſuch a Communion what better inducement could be thought of, than to demonſtrate that what was Univerſally believed of all Chriſtians, if it were joyned with a love of truth, and with holy obedience, was ſufficient to bring men to Heaven? For why ſhould men be more rigid than God? Why ſhould any Error exclude any man from the Churches Communion, which will not deprive him of Eternal Salvation? Now that Chriſtians do generally agree in all thoſe points of Doctrine, which are neceſſary to Salvation, it is apparent, becauſe they agree with one accord, in believing all thoſe Books of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, which in the Church were never doubted of to be the undoubted Word of God. And it is ſo certain that in all theſe Books, all neceſſary Doctrines are evidently contained, that of all the four Evangeliſts this is very.

ry probable, but of S. *Luke* moſt apparent, that in every one of their Books they have comprehended the whole ſubſtance of the Goſpel of Chriſt. For what reaſon can be imagined, that any of them ſhould leave out any thing which he knew to be neceſſary, and yet (as apparently all of them have done) put in many things which they knew to be only profitable and not neceſſary? What wiſe and honeſt man that were now to write the Goſpel of Chriſt, would do ſo great a work of God after ſuch a negligent faſhion? Suppoſe *Xaverius* had been to write the Goſpel of Chriſt for the *Indians*, think you he would have left out any Fundamental Doctrine of it? If not, I muſt beſeech you to conceive as well of S. *Matthew*, and S. *Mark*, and S. *Luke*, and S. *John*, as you do of *Xaverius*. Beſides, if every one of them have not in them all neceſſary Doctrines, how have they complied with their own deſign, which was, as the Titles of their Books ſhew, to write *the Goſpel of Chriſt*, and not a part of it? Or how have they not deceived us, in giving them ſuch Titles? By the whole Goſpel of Chriſt, I underſtand not the whole Hiſtory of Chriſt, but all that makes up the Covenant between God and Man. Now if this be wholly contained in the Goſpel of Saint *Mark* and Saint *John*, I believe every conſidering man will be inclinable to believe that then without doubt, it is contained, with the advantage of many other very profitable things, in the larger Goſpels of Saint *Matthew*, and Saint *Luke*. And that Saint *Marks* Goſpel wants no neceſſary Article of this Covenant, I preſume you will not deny, if you believe *Irenæus* when he ſays, *Matthew to the* Hebrews *in their Tongue publiſhed the Scripture of the Goſpel: When* Peter *and* Paul *did Preach the Goſpel, and found the Church or a Church at* Rome, *or of* Rome, *and after their departure* Mark *the Scholar of* Peter, *delivered to us in writing thoſe things which had been Preached by* Peter; *and* Luke, *the follower of* Paul, *compiled in a Book the Goſpel which was Preached by him: And afterwards* John, *reſiding in* Aſia, *in the City of* Epheſus, *did himſelf alſo ſet forth a Goſpel.*

41. In

41. In which words of *Irenæus*, it is remarkable that they are ſpoken by him againſt ſome Hereticks, that pretended (as you know who do now adaies) that *ſome neceſſary Doctrines of the Goſpel were unwritten*, and that *out of the Scriptures, truth* (he muſt mean ſufficient truth,) *cannot be found by thoſe which know not Tradition.* Againſt whom to ſay, that part of the Goſpel which was Preached by S *Peter* was written by S *Mark*, and ſo other neceſſary parts of it omitted, had been to ſpeak impertinently, and rather to confirm than confute their Error. It is plain therefore, that he muſt mean, as I pretend, that all the neceſſary Doctrine of the Goſpel, which was Preached by Saint *Peter*, was written by Saint *Mark*. Now you will not deny, I preſume, that Saint *Peter*, Preached all, therefore you muſt not deny that S. *Mark* wrote all. *Lib.* 3. *c.* 2.

42. Our next inquiry let it be touching S. *Johns* intent in writing his Goſpel, whether it were to deliver ſo much truth, as being believed and obeyed would certainly bring men to Eternal Life, or only part of it, and to leave part unwritten? A great man there is, but much leſs than the Apoſtle, who ſaith, that *writing laſt, he purpoſed to ſupply the defects of the other Evangeliſts, that had wrote before him:* which (if it were true) would ſufficiently juſtifie what I have undertaken, that at-leaſt all the four Evangeliſts have in them, all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpel of Chriſt. Neither will I deny, but S. *Johns* ſecondary intent might be to ſupply the defects of the former three Goſpels, in ſome things very profitable. But he that pretends, that any neceſſary Doctrine is in S. *John* which is in none of the other Evangeliſts, hath not ſo well conſidered them as he ſhould do, before he pronounce ſentence of ſo weighty a matter. And for his prime intent in writing his Goſpel, what that was, certainly no Father in the World underſtood it better than himſelf. Therefore let us hear him ſpeak: *Many other ſigns* (ſaith he) *alſo did Jeſus in the ſight of his Diſciples, which are not written in this Book: But theſe are written, that you may believe that Jeſus is Chriſt the Son of God, and that believing you may have Life in his name.*

By

By (*theſe are written*) may be underſtood, either *theſe things* are written, or *theſe ſigns* are written. Take it which way you will, this concluſion will certainly follow, That either all that which S. *John* wrote in his Goſpel, or leſs than all, and therefore all much more was ſufficient to make them believe that which being believed with lively Faith, would certainly bring them to Eternal Life.

43. This which hath been ſpoken (I hope) is enough to juſtifie my undertaking to the full, that it is very probable that every one of the four Evangeliſts has in his Book the whole ſubſtance, all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpel of Chriſt. But for Saint *Luke*, that he hath written ſuch a perfect Goſpel, in my judgment it ought to be with them that believe him, no manner of queſtion. Conſider firſt the introduction to his Goſpel, where he declares what he intends to write, in theſe Words, *For as much as many have taken in hand to ſet forth in order a Declaration of thoſe things, which are moſt ſurely believed amongſt us, even as they delivered unto us, which from the beginning were Eye-witneſſes, and Miniſters of the Word, it ſeemed good to me alſo, having had perfect underſtanding of things from the firſt, to write to thee in order, moſt excellent* Theophilus, *that thou mighteſt know the certainty, of thoſe things wherein thou haſt been inſtructed.* Add to this place, the entrance to his *Hiſtory of the* Acts *of the Apoſtles: The former Treatiſe have I made,* O Theophilus, *of all that Jeſus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up.* Weigh well theſe two places, and then anſwer me freely and ingenuouſly to theſe demands. 1. Whether S. *Luke* does not undertake the very ſame thing which he ſays, *many had taken in hand?* 2. Whether this were not *to ſet forth in order, a Declaration of thoſe things which are moſt ſurely believed amongſt Chriſtians?* 3. Whether the whole Goſpel of Chriſt, and every neceſſary Doctrine of it, were not ſurely believed among Chriſtians? 4. Whether they which were *Eye-witneſſes and Miniſters of the Word from the beginning, delivered not the whole Goſpel of Chriſt?* 5. Whether he does not undertake to write in order theſe things

things *whereof he had perfect underſtanding* from the firſt? 6. Whether he had not perfect underſtanding of the whole Goſpel of Chriſt? 7. Whether he doth not undertake to write to *Theophilus* of all thoſe things *wherein he had been inſtructed*? 8. And whether he had not been inſtructed in all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpel of Chriſt? 9. Whether in the other Text, *All things which Jeſus began to do and teach*, muſt not at leaſt imply, all the principal and neceſſary things? 10. Whether this be not the very interpretation of your *Rhemiſh* Doctors, in their Annotation upon this place? 11. Whether all theſe Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, without the belief whereof, no man can be ſaved, be not the principal and moſt neceſſary things which *Jeſus* taught? 12. And laſtly, whether many things which S. *Luke* has wrote in his Goſpel, be not leſs principal, and leſs neceſſary than all and every one of theſe? When you have well conſidered theſe propoſals, I believe you will be very apt to think (if S. *Luke* be of credit with you) That all things neceſſary to ſalvation, are certainly contained in his writings alone. And from hence you will not chooſe but conclude, that ſeeing all the Chriſtians in the world, agree in the belief of what S. *Luke* hath written, and not only ſo, but in all other Books of Canonical Scripture, which were never doubted of in and by the Church, the Learned Arch-Biſhop had very juſt, and certain ground to ſay, *That in theſe Propoſitions, which without Controverſie are univerſally received in the whole Chriſtian world, ſo much truth is contained, as being joyned with holy obedience, may be ſufficient to bring a man to everlaſting Salvation; and that we have no cauſe to doubt, but that as many as walk according to this rule, neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by ſuperinducing any damnable Hereſie thereupon, nor otherwiſe vitiating their holy faith, with a lewd and wicked converſation, peace ſhall be upon them, and upon the Iſrael of God.*

44. Againſt this, you object two things. The one, that by this Rule, *ſeeing the Doctrin of the Trinity is not received univerſally among Chriſtians, the denial of it ſhall not exclude Salvation.* The other, that the *Biſhop contradicts him-*

ſelf, in ſuppoſing a man may believe all neceſſary Truths, and yet ſuperinduce ſome damnable Hereſies.

45. To the firſt I anſwer, what I conceive he would, whoſe words I here juſtify, that he hath declared plainly in this very place, that he meant, not an abſolute, but a limited Univerſality, and ſpeaks not of propoſitions univerſally believed by all Profeſſions of Chriſtianity that are, but only, by all thoſe ſeveral Profeſſions of Chriſtianity, that have any large ſpread in *any part of the world*. By which words he excludes from the univerſality here ſpoken of, the denyers of the Doctrin of the Trinity, as being but a handful of men, in reſpect of all, nay in reſpect of any of theſe profeſſions which maintain it. And therefore it was a great fault in you, either willingly to conceal theſe words, which evacuate your objection, or elſe negligently to overſee them.

46. Now for the foul Contradiction, wherein I pray does it lie? *In ſuppoſing* (ſay you) *a man may believe all Truths neceſſary to ſalvation, and yet ſuperinduce a damnable Hereſie.* I anſwer, It is not certain that his words do ſuppoſe this: neither if they do, does he contradict himſelf. I ſay it is not certain that his words import any ſuch matter. For ordinarily men uſe to ſpeak and write ſo as here he does, when they intend not to limit or reſtrain, but only to repeat and preſs and illuſtrate what they have ſaid before.

S. *Athanaſius* in his Creed tells us, *The Catholick Faith is this, that we worſhip one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Perſons nor dividing the Subſtance*; and why now do you not tell him that he contradicts himſelf, and ſuppoſes that we may worſhip a Trinity of Perſons, and one God in ſubſtance, and yet confound the Perſons, or divide the Subſtance; which yet is impoſſible, becauſe Three remaining Three, cannot be confounded, and One remaining One cannot be divided? If a man ſhould ſay unto you, he that keeps all the Commandments of God, committing no ſin either againſt the love of God, or the love of his neighbour, is a perfect man: Or thus, he that will live in conſtant health had need be exact in his diet, neither eating too much, nor too little: Or thus, he

that

that will come to *London* muſt go on ſtraight forward in ſuch a way, und neither turn to the right hand or to the left; I verily believe you would not find any contradiction in his words, but confeſs them as coherent and conſonant as any in your Book. And certainly if you would look upon this ſaying of the Biſhop with any indifference, you would eaſily perceive it to be of the very ſame kind, and capable of the very ſame conſtruction. And therefore one of the grounds of your accuſation is uncertain; Neither can you aſſure us, that the Biſhop ſuppoſes any ſuch matter as you pretend. Neither if he did ſuppoſe this (as perhaps he did) were this to contradict himſelf. For though there can be no damnable Hereſie, unleſs it contradict ſome neceſſary Truth, yet there is no contradiction but the ſame man may at once believe this Hereſie and this Truth; becauſe there is no contradiction that the ſame man, at the ſame time, ſhould believe contradictions. For, firſt, whatſoever a man believes true, that he may and muſt believe; but there have been ſome who have believed and taught that contradictions might be true, againſt whom *Ariſtotle* diſputes in the third of his *Metaphyſicks*; Therefore it is not impoſſible that a man may believe contradictions. Secondly, they which believe there is no certainty in Reaſon, muſt believe that contradictions may be true: For otherwiſe there will be certainty in this Reaſon; This contradicts Truth, therefore it is falſe. But there be now divers in the world who believe there is no certainty in reaſon, (and whether you be of their mind or no, I deſire to be informed;) Therefore there be divers in the world who believe contradictions may be true. Thirdly, They which do captivate their underſtandings to the belief of thoſe things which to their underſtanding ſeem irreconcileable contradictions, may as well believe real contradictions: (For the difficulty of believing ariſes not from their being repugnant, but from their ſeeming to be ſo:) But you do captivate your underſtandings to the belief of thoſe things which ſeem to your underſtandings irreconcileable contradictions; therefore it is as poſſible and eaſie for you to believe thoſe that indeed

are ſo. Fourthly, ſome men may be confuted in their Errors, and perſwaded out of them; but no mans Error can be confuted, who together with his Error doth not believe and grant ſome true principle that contradicts his Error: for nothing can be proved to him who grants nothing, neither can there be (as all men know) any rational diſcourſe but out of grounds agreed upon by both parts. Therefore it is not impoſſible but abſolutely certain, that the ſame man at the ſame time may believe contradictions. Fifthly, It is evident, neither can you without extream madneſs and uncharitableneſs, deny, that we believe the Bible, thoſe Books I mean which we believe Canonical: Otherwiſe why diſpute you with us out of them, as out of a common Principle? Either therefore you muſt retract your opinion, and acknowledge that the ſame man at the ſame time may believe contradictions, or elſe you will run into a greater inconvenience, and be forced to confeſs, that no part of our Doctrin contradicts the Bible. Sixthly, I deſire you to vindicate from contradiction theſe following Aſſertions: That there ſhould be Length, and nothing long: Breadth, and nothing broad: Thickneſs, and nothing thick: Whiteneſs, and nothing white: Roundneſs, and nothing round: Weight, and nothing heavy: Sweetneſs, and nothing ſweet: Moiſture, and nothing moiſt: Fluidneſs, and nothing flowing: many Actions, and no Agent: many Paſſions, and no Patient: That is, that there ſhould be a long, broad, thick, white, round, heavy, ſweet, moiſt, flowing, active, paſſive, nothing! That Bread ſhould be turned into the ſubſtance of Chriſt, and yet not any thing of the Bread become any thing of Chriſt; neither the matter, nor the form, nor the Accidents of Bread, be made either the matter or the Form, or the Accidents of Chriſt. That Bread ſhould be turned into nothing, and at the ſame time with the ſame action turned into Chriſt, and yet Chriſt ſhould not be nothing. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould have its juſt dimenſions, and juſt diſtance of its parts, one from another, and at the ſame time not have it, but all its parts together in one and the ſelf ſame point. That the body of Chriſt,

Chriſt, which is much greater, ſhould be contained wholly and in its full dimenſions without any alteration, in that which is leſſer, and that not once only, but as many times over as there are ſeveral points in the bread and wine. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould be wholly above it ſelf, and wholly below it ſelf, within it ſelf, and without it ſelf, on the right hand, and on the left hand, and round about it ſelf. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould move to and from it ſelf, and lie ſtill: Or that it ſhould be carried from one place to another through the middle ſpace, and yet not move. That it ſhould be brought from Heaven to Earth, and yet not come out of Heaven, nor be at all in any of the middle ſpace between Heaven and Earth. That to be one, ſhould be to be undivided from it ſelf, and yet that one and the ſame thing ſhould be divided from it ſelf. That a thing may be, and yet be no where. That a Finite thing may be in all places at once. That a Body may be in a place, and have there its dimenſions, and colour, and all other qualities, and yet that it is not in the power of God to make it viſible, and tangible there, nor capable of doing or ſuffering any thing. That there ſhould be no certainty in our ſenſes, and yet that we ſhould know ſomething certainly, and yet know nothing but by our ſenſes. That that which is, and was long ago, ſhould now begin to be. That that is now to be made of nothing, which is not nothing but ſomething. That the ſame thing ſhould be before and after it ſelf. That it ſhould be truly and really in a place, and yet without Locality. Nay, that He which is Omnipotent ſhould not be able to give it Locality in this place, where it is, as ſome of you hold: or if he can, as others ſay he can, that it ſhould be poſſible, that the ſame man, for example You or I, may at the ſame time, be awake at *London*, & not awake but aſleep at *Rome*: There run or walk, here not run or walk, but ſtand ſtill, ſit, or lie along: There ſtudy or write, here do neither, but dine or ſup: There ſpeak, here be ſilent. That he may in one place freez for cold, in another burn with heat. That he may be drunk in one place, and ſober in another: Valiant in one place, and a Coward in another:

A thief in one place, honeſt in another. That he may be a *Papiſt* and go to *Maß* in *Rome*; A *Proteſtant* and go to Church in *England*. That he may die in *Rome*, and live in *England*: or dying in both places may go to Hell from *Rome*, and to Heaven from *England*. That the Body and Soul of Chriſt ſhould ceaſe to be where it was, and yet not go to another place, nor be deſtroyed. All theſe, and many other of the like nature are the unavoidable, and moſt of them the acknowledged conſequences of your doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, as is explained one where or other by your School-men. Now I beſeech you, Sir, to try your skill, and if you can compoſe their repugnance, and make peace between them; Certainly, none but you ſhall be *Catholick Moderator*. But if you cannot do it, and that after an intelligible manner, then you muſt give me leave to believe, that either you do not believe Tranſubſtantiation, or elſe that it is no contradiction, that men ſhould ſubjugate their underſtandings to the belief of contradictions.

48. Ad §. 18. This Paragraph conſiſts of two immodeſt untruths, obtruded upon us without ſhew, or ſhadow of reaſon: and an evident ſophiſm grounded upon an affected miſtake of the ſenſe of the word *Fundamental*.

49. The firſt untruth is, that *ſome Proteſtants make a Church, of men ſcarcely agreeing in one point of faith; of men concurring in ſome one or few Articles of belief, and in the reſt holding conceits plainly contradictory: agreeing only in this one Article, that Chriſt is our Saviour*; &c.

Anſ. This is a ſhameleſs Calumny; becauſe even theſe men to the conſtituting of the very eſſence of a Church, in the loweſt degree, require not only *Faith in Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God and Saviour of the World*, but alſo *ſubmiſſion to his Doctrin in mind and will*. Now I beſeech you Sir, tell me ingenuouſly, whether the Doctrin of Chriſt may be called without blaſphemy, *ſcarcely one point of Faith?* Or whether it conſiſts only, *of ſome one or few Articles of belief?* Or whether there be nothing in it, but only this Article, *That Chriſt is our Saviour?* Is it not manifeſt to all the world, that Chriſtians of all Profeſſions do agree with one conſent, in the belief of all thoſe Books of Scripture, which

which were not doubted of in the ancient Church, without danger of damnation? Nay is it not apparent, that no man at this time, can without hypocriſie, pretend to believe in Chriſt, but of neceſſity he muſt do ſo? Seeing he can have no reaſon to believe in Chriſt, but he muſt have the ſame to believe the Scripture. I pray then read over the Scripture once more, or if that be too much labour, the New Teſtament only: and then ſay whether there be nothing there, but *ſcarcely one point of Faith? But ſome one or two Articles of belief? Nothing but this Article only, that Chriſt is our Saviour?* Say whether there be not there an infinite number of Divine Verities, Divine precepts, Divine promiſes, and thoſe ſo plainly and undoubtedly delivered, that if any ſees them not, it cannot be becauſe he cannot, but becauſe he will not! So plainly, that whoſoever ſubmits ſincerely to the Doctrin of Chriſt, in mind and will, cannot poſſibly but ſubmit to theſe in act and performance. And in the reſt, which it hath pleaſed God, for reaſons beſt known to himſelf, to deliver obſcurely or ambiguouſly, yet thus far at leaſt they agree, that the ſenſe of them intended by God, is certainly true, and that they are without paſſion or prejudice to endeavor to find it out: The difference only is, which is that true ſenſe which God intended. Neither would this long continue, if the walls of ſeparation, whereby the Divel hopes to make their Diviſions eternal, were pulled down; and Error were not ſupported againſt Truth, by human advantages. But for the preſent, God forbid the matter ſhould be ſo ill as you make it! For whereas you looking upon their points of difference and agreement, through I know not what ſtrange glaſſes, have made the firſt innumerable, and the other ſcarce a number: the Truth is clean contrary; that thoſe divine Verities, Speculative and Practical, wherein they univerſally agree (which you will have to be but a few, or but one, or ſcarcely one) amount to *many millions*, (if an exact account were taken of them:) And on the other ſide, the Points in variance, are in compariſon but few, and thoſe not of ſuch a quality, but the Error in them may well conſiſt with the belief

and

and obedience of the entire Covenant, ratified by Chriſt between God and man. Yet I would not be ſo miſtaken, as if I thought the Errors even of ſome *Proteſtants* unconſiderable things, and matters of no moment. For the truth is, I am very fearful, that ſome of their opinions, either as they are, or as they are apt to be miſtaken, (though not of themſelves ſo damnable, but that good and holy men may be ſaved with them, yet) are too frequent occaſions of our remiſsneſs, and ſlackneſs, in running the race of Chriſtian Perfection, of our deferring Repentance, and converſion to God, of our frequent relapſes into ſin, and not ſeldom of ſecurity in ſinning; and conſequently, though not certain cauſes, yet too frequent occaſions of many mens damnation: and ſuch I conceive all theſe Doctrines which either directly or obliquely, put men in hope of Eternal happineſs, by any other means ſaving only the narrow way *of ſincere and Univerſal obedience*, grounded upon a true and lively Faith. Theſe Errors therefore, I do not elevate or extenuate: and on condition the ruptures made by them might be compoſed, do heartily wiſh, that the cement were made of my deareſt Blood, and only not to be an *Anathema* from Chriſt! Only this I ſay, that neither are their points of agreement ſo few, nor their differences ſo many, as you make them, nor ſo great as to exclude the oppoſite Parties from being members of one Church Militant, and Joynt Heirs of the Glory of the Church Triumphant.

50. Your other palpable untruth is, that *Proteſtants are far more bold to diſagree even in matters of Faith, than Catholick Divines* (you mean your own,] *in Queſtions meerly Philoſophical, or not determined by the Church.* For neither do they differ at all, in *matters of Faith*, if you take the word in the higheſt ſenſe, and mean by matters of Faith, ſuch Doctrines as are *abſolutely neceſſary* to Salvation, to be believed or not to be disbelieved. And then in thoſe wherein they do differ, with what colour or ſhadow of Argument, can you make good, that *they are more bold to diſagree, than you are in Queſtions meerly Philoſophical, or not determined by the Church?* For is there not as great repug-

pugnancy between your aſſent and diſſent, your affirmation and negation, your *Eſt Eſt, Non Non*, as there is between theirs? You follow your Reaſon, in thoſe things which are not determined by your Church; and they theirs, in things not plainly determined in Scripture. And wherein then conſiſts their greater, *their far greater boldneſs*? And what if they in their contradictory opinions, pretend both to rely upon the truth of God, doth this make their contradictions ever a whit the more repugnant? I had always thought, that all contradictions had been equally contradictions, and equally repugnant; becauſe the leaſt of them are as far aſunder, as *Eſt* and *Non Eſt* can make them, and the greateſt are no farther. But then you in your differences, (by name, about Predetermination, the Immaculate Conception, the *Popes* Infallibility,) upon what other motive do you rely? Do not you cite Scripture, or Tradition, or both, on both ſides? And do you not pretend, that both theſe are the infallible Truths of Almighty God?

51. You cloſe up this Section with a fallacy, proving forſooth, that *we deſtroy, by our confeſſion, the Church which is the Houſe of God, becauſe we ſtand only upon Fundamental Articles, which cannot make up the whole Fabrick of the Faith, no more than the Foundation of a Houſe alone can be a Houſe.*

52. But I hope, Sir, you will not be difficult in granting, that that is a Houſe which hath all the neceſſary parts belonging to a Houſe: now by Fundamental Articles, we mean all thoſe which are neceſſary; and then I hope you will grant that we may ſafely expect Salvation in a Church, which hath all things Fundamental to Salvation; Unleſs you will ſay, that more is neceſſary, than that which is neceſſary.

53. Ad §. 19.] This long diſcourſe is to ſhew that *Proteſtants give unavoidable occaſion of deſperation to poor Souls*, and brings in a Man deſirous to ſave his Soul, asking Queſtions of *D. P.* and makes anſwers for him. As firſt, if he required, *whoſe directions he might rely upon?* He ſays, the Doctor's Anſwer would be, *upon the truly Catholick Church.*

But I ſuppoſe upon better reaſon, becauſe I know his mind, that he would adviſe him to *call no man Maſter upon Earth*, but according to Chriſts command, to rely upon the *direction of God himſelf*. If he ask, where he ſhould find this direction? he would anſwer him, *In his Word contained in Scripture*. If he ſhould inquire what aſſurance he might have that the *Scripture is the Word of God*? He would anſwer him, that the Doctrine it ſelf is very fit and worthy to be thought to come from God, (*nec vox hominem ſonat*) and that they which wrote and delivered it, confirmed it to be the Word of God, by doing ſuch works as could not be done, but by Power from God himſelf. For aſſurance of the Truth hereof, he would adviſe him to rely upon that which all Wiſe Men, in all matters of belief rely upon; and that is, the conſent of Ancient records, and Univerſal Tradition. No Wiſe Man doubts but there was ſuch a man as *Julius Cæſar*, or *Cicero*, that there are ſuch Cities as *Rome* or *Conſtantinople*, though he have no other aſſurance for the one or the other, but only the *ſpeech* of People. This Tradition therefore he would counſel him to rely upon, and to believe that the Book which we call Scripture, was confirmed abundantly by the Works of God, to be the Word of God. Believing it the Word of God, he muſt of neceſſity believe it true: and if he believe it true, he muſt believe it contains all neceſſary directions unto Eternal Happineſs, becauſe it affirms it ſelf to do ſo. Nay he might tell him, that ſo far is the whole Book, from wanting any neceſſary direction to his Eternal Salvation, that one only Author, that hath writ but two little Books of it, Saint *Luke* by name in the beginning of his *Goſpel*, and in the beginning of his *Story*, ſhews plainly that he alone hath written at leaſt ſo much as is neceſſary. And what they wrote, they wrote by Gods direction, for the direction of the World, not only for the Learned, but for all that would do their true endeavour to know the will of God, and to do it; therefore you cannot but conceive, that writing to all and for all, they wrote ſo as that in things neceſſary they might be underſtood by all. Beſides that,

here

here he ſhould find, that God himſelf has engaged himſelf by promiſe, that if he would love him, and keep his Commandments, and pray earneſtly for his Spirit, and be willing to be directed by it, he ſhould undoubtedly receive it, even the *Spirit of Truth which ſhall lead him into all Truth*; that is certainly, into all neceſſary Truths, and ſuffer him to fall into no pernitious Error. The ſum of his whole direction to him briefly would be this, Believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, uſe your true endeavour to find the true ſenſe of it, and to live according to it, and then you may reſt ſecurely that you are in the true way to Eternal Happineſs. This is the ſubſtance of that Anſwer which the Doctor would make to any man in this caſe; and this is a way ſo plain, that Fools, unleſs they will, cannot Err from it. Becauſe not knowing abſolutely all truth, nay not all profitable truth, and not being free from Error; but endeavouring to know the truth and obey it, and endeavouring to be free from Error, is by this way made the only condition of Salvation.

56. Neither is this to drive any man to deſparation; unleſs it be ſuch a one as hath ſuch a ſtrong affection to this word, *Church*, that he will not go to Heaven, *unleſs he hath a Church to lead him thither.* For what though a Council may Err, and the whole Church cannot be conſulted with, yet this is not to ſend you on the Fools *Pilgrimage for Faith*, and bid you go and *confer with every Chriſtian Soul, Man and Woman, by Sea and by Land, cloſe Priſoner, or at Liberty*, as you dilate the matter: But to tell you very briefly, that Univerſal Tradition directs you to the Word of God, and the Word of God directs you to Heaven.

57. To the next demand, *How ſhall I know whether he hold all Fundamental points or no?* When *Proteſtants* anſwer, *If he truly believe the undoubted Books of Canonical Scripture, he cannot but believe all Fundamentals*, and that it is *very probable* that the *Creed contains all the Fundamentals of ſimple belief:* The Jeſuite takes no notice of the former, but takes occaſion from the latter to ask. *Shall I hazard my Soul*

on Probabilities, or even Wagers? As if whatſoever is but probable, though in the higheſt degree of Probability, were as likely to be falſe as true! or becauſe it is but *Morally*, not Mathematically certain, that there was ſuch a Woman as *Q. Elizabeth*, ſuch a man as *Hen.* the 8*th.* that is in the higheſt degree probable, therefore it were an even Wager there were none ſuch! By this Reaſon ſeeing the truth of your whole Religion depends finally upon *Prudential motives*, which you do but pretend to be very credible, it will be *an even Wager that your Religion is falſe.* And by the ſame Reaſon, or rather infinitely greater, ſeeing it is impoſſible for any man (according to the grounds of your Religion) to know himſelf, much leſs another to be a true *Pope*, or a true Prieſt; nay to have a Moral certainty of it, becauſe theſe things are obnoxious to innumerable ſecret and undiſcernable nullities, it will be an even Wager, nay (if we proportion things indifferently, a hundred to one, that every Conſecration and Abſolution of yours is void, and that whenſoever you adore the Hoſt, you and your Aſſiſtants commit Idolatry: That there is a nullity in any decree that a *Pope* ſhall make, or any Decree of a Council which he ſhall confirm: Particularly it will be at leaſt an even Wager, that all the decrees of the Council of *Trent* are void, becauſe it is at moſt but very probable that the *Pope* which confirmed them was true *Pope.*

62. *Obj.* But *unleſs this Queſtion be anſwered,* (what points of the Creed are, and what are not Fundamentals?) *the* Proteſtant *Doctrine ſerves only either to make men deſpare, or elſe to have recourſe to thoſe called* Papiſts.

Anſw. It ſeems a little thing will make you deſpair, if you be ſo ſullen as to do ſo, becauſe men will not trouble themſelves to ſatisfie your curious queſtions. And I pray be not offended with me for ſo eſteeming it, becauſe as before I told you, if you will believe all the points of the Creed, you cannot chooſe but believe all the points of it that are Fundamental, though you be ignorant which are ſo, and which are not ſo. Now I believe your deſire to know which are Fundamentals, proceeds only

only from a deſire to be aſſured that you do believe them; which ſeeing you may be aſſured of, without knowing which they be, what can it be but curioſity to deſire to know it? Neither may you think to mend your ſelf herein one whit by having recourſe to them whom we call *Papiſts*; for they are as far to ſeek as we in this point, which of the Articles of the Creed are, for their nature and matter, Fundamental, and which are not. Particularly, you will ſcarce meet with any amongſt their Doctors, ſo adventurous, as to tell you for a certain, whether or no the conception of Chriſt by the Holy Ghoſt, his being born of a Virgin, his Burial, his deſcent into Hell, and the Communion of Saints, be points of their own nature and matter Fundamental. Such I mean, as without the diſtinct and explicite knowledge of them no man can be ſaved.

63. *Obj.* We give this certain Rule, *that all points defined by Chriſts Viſible Church, belong to the Foundation of Faith, in this ſenſe, that to deny any ſuch, cannot ſtand with Salvation.*

Anſw. So alſo Proteſtants give you this more certain rule, That whoſoever believes heartily thoſe Books of Scripture, which all the Chriſtian Churches in the World acknowledge to be Canonical, and ſubmits himſelf indeed to this, as to the rule of his belief, muſt of neceſſity believe all things Fundamental, and if he live according to his Faith, cannot fail of Salvation. But beſides, what certainty have you, that that rule of *Papiſts* is ſo certain? By the viſible Church it is plain, they mean only their own: and why their own only ſhould be the Viſible Church, I do not underſtand: and as little, why all points defined by this Church ſhould belong to the Foundation of Faith. Theſe things you had need ſee well and ſubſtantially proved, before you rely upon them, otherwiſe you expoſe your ſelf to danger of imbracing damnable Errors inſtead of Fundamental Truths.

67. Ad §. 23, 24, 25.] *D. P.* demands, *How it can be neceſſary for any Chriſtian, to have more in his Creed than the Apoſtles had.* And this he enforces with many Arguments

ments, thus. *May the Church of after Ages make the narrow way to heaven, narrower than our Saviour left it? Shall it be a fault to ſtraiten and encomber the Kings high way with publick nuiſances; and is it lawful by adding new Articles to the Faith, to retrench any thing from the Latitude of the King of Heavens high way to Eternal happineſs? The Yoak of Chriſt, which he ſaid was eaſie, may it be juſtly made heavier by the Governors of the Church in after Ages? The Apoſtles profeſs they revealed to the Church the whole Counſel of God, keeping back nothing needful for our Salvation. What Tyranny then to impoſe any new unneceſſary matters on the Faith of Chriſtians, eſpecially (as the late* Popes *have done) under the high commanding form,* Qui non crediderit, damnabitur? *He that believeth not, ſhall be damned. If this may be done, why then did our Saviour reprehend the Phariſees ſo ſharply, for binding heavy burdens, and laying them on mens ſhoulders? And why did he teach them, that in vain they worſhiped God, teaching for Doctrines mens Traditions? And why did the Apoſtles call it tempting of God, to lay thoſe things upon the Necks of Chriſtians, that were not neceſſary?*

68. All which interrogations ſeem to me to contain ſo many plain and convincing Arguments of the premiſed Aſſertion; and if you can deviſe no fair and ſatisfying anſwer to them, then be ſo ingenuous as to grant the Concluſion, *That no more can be neceſſary for Chriſtians to believe now, than was in the Apoſtles time.* A concluſion of great importance, for the deciding of many Controverſies, and the disburdening of the Faith of Chriſt from many incumbrances.

70. The Doctor to make good this concluſion argues further thus, S. *Paul* declared to the *Epheſians* the whole Counſel of God touching their Salvation. Therefore that which S. *Paul* did not declare, can be no part of the Counſel of God, and therefore not neceſſary. And again; S. *Paul* kept back nothing from the *Epheſians* that was profitable; Therefore he taught them all things neceſſary to Salvation.

71. Neither is it material, that theſe words were particularly directed by S. *Paul*, to the Paſtours of the Church: For

For (to ſay nothing that the point here iſſuable, is not, Whom he taught, whether Prieſts or *Laymen*? But how much he taught, and whether all things neceſſary?) it appears plainly out of the Text, and I wonder you ſhould read it ſo negligently as not to obſerve it, that though he ſpeaks now to the Paſtors, yet he ſpeaks of what he taught not only them, but alſo the Laity as well as them. *I have kept back nothing* (ſays S. *Paul*) *that was profitable, but have ſhewed, and have taught you publickly, and from Houſe to Houſe; Teſtifying* (I pray obſerve) *both to the* Jews, *and alſo to the* Greeks *Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And a little after, *I know that ye all, among whom I have gone Preaching the Kingdom of God, ſhall ſee my Face no more: Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am Innocent from the Blood of all men; for I have kept nothing back, but have ſhewed you all the Counſel of God.* And again, *Remember that by the ſpace of three Years I ceaſed not to warn every one Night and Day with Tears.* Certainly though he did all theſe things to the Paſtors among the reſt, nay above the reſt, yet without Controverſie, they whom he taught publickly, and from Houſe to Houſe: The *Jews* and *Greeks* to whom he *Teſtified* (i. e.) *Preached* Faith and Repentance: Thoſe all, amongſt whom he went preaching the Kingdom of God: Thoſe, Every one, whom for three Years together he warned, were not Biſhops and Paſtors only.

72. Neither is this to ſay, that the Apoſtles taught Chriſtians nothing but their Creed, nothing of the Sacraments, Commandments, *&c.* for that is not here the point to be proved: but only, that they taught them all things neceſſary, ſo that nothing can be neceſſary which they did not teach them. But how much of this they put into their Creed, whether *all the neceſſary points of ſimple belief*, as we pretend, or only as you ſay, *I know not what*, is another Queſtion now to be examined.

73. We urge againſt you, *That if all neceſſary points of ſimple belief be not comprized in the Creed, it can no way deſerve the name of the Apoſtles Creed, as not being their Creed in any ſenſe, but only a part of it.* To

To this you ſay, *That the Faith of the Apoſtles is of larger extent, than their Creed.* Anſwer, It is very true that their whole Faith was of a larger extent, but that was not the Queſtion; but whether all points of ſimple belief which they taught as neceſſary to be explicitely believed, be not contained in it? And if thus much at leaſt of Chriſtian Religion be not comprized in it, I again deſire you to inform me how it could be called the Apoſtles Creed?

74. To other Reaſons grounded upon the practice of the Ancient Church; appointing her Infants to be inſtructed (for matters of ſimple belief,) only in the Creed: From her admitting Catechumens unto Baptiſm: and of Strangers unto her Communion, upon their only profeſſion of the Creed, you have not, that I perceive, thought fit to make any kind of anſwer.

75. Ad §. 26.] In this Section you practiſe that trick of a Caviller, which is to anſwer Objections by other Objections; an excellent way to make Controverſies endleſs! D. *Potter* deſires to be reſolved, *Why amongſt many things of equal neceſſity to be believed, the Apoſtles ſhould diſtinctly ſet down ſome in the Creed, and be altogether ſilent of others?* Inſtead of reſolving him in this difficulty, you put another to him, and that is, *Why are ſome points not Fundamental expreſſed in it, rather than others of the ſame quality?* Which demand is ſo far from ſatisfying the former doubt, that it makes it more intricate. For upon this ground it may be demanded, How was it poſſible that the Apoſtles ſhould leave out any Articles ſimply neceſſary, and put in others not neceſſary, eſpecially if their intention were (as you ſay it was) to deliver in it ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times? Unleſs (which were wondrous ſtrange) unneceſſary Articles were fitter for thoſe times, than neceſſary. But now to your Queſtion, the Anſwer is obvious: Theſe unneceſſary things might be put in, becauſe they were circumſtances of the neceſſary, *Pontius Pilate* of Chriſts paſſion, The third day of the Reſurrection; neither doth the adding of them make the Creed ever a whit the leſs probable, the leſs fit

to

to be underſtood, and remembred. And for the contrary reaſons, other unneceſſary things might be left out. Beſides, who ſees not that the addition of ſome unneceſſary circumſtances is a thing that can hardly be avoided without affectation! And therefore not ſo great a fault, nor deſerving ſuch a cenſure, as the omiſſion of any thing eſſential to the work undertaken, and neceſſary to the end propoſed in it.

76. You demand again (as it is no hard matter to multiply demands,) *why our Saviours deſcent into Hell, and Burial was expreſſed, and not his circumciſion, his manifeſtation to the three Kings, and working of Miracles?* I anſwer: His Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, and ſitting at the right hand of God, are very great Miracles, and they are expreſſed. Beſides, S. *John* aſſures us, *That the Miracles which Chriſt did, were done and written not for themſelves that they might be believed*, but for a further end, that *we might believe that Jeſus was the Chriſt, and believing have eternal life.* He therefore that believes this may be ſaved, though he have no explicite and diſtinct Faith of any Miracle that our Saviour did. His Circumciſion and Manifeſtation to the Wiſe men (for I know not upon what grounds you call them *Kings*) are neither things ſimply neceſſary to be known, nor have any near relation to thoſe that are ſo. As for his Deſcent into Hell, it may (for ought you know) be put in as a thing neceſſary of it ſelf to be known. If you ask why more than his Circumciſion, I refer you to the Apoſtles for an anſwer, who put that in, and left this out of their Creed: and yet ſure, were not ſo *forgetful after the receiving of the Holy Ghoſt, as to leave out any prime and principal foundation of the faith*, which are the very words of your own *Gordonius Huntlæus*, *Cont.* 2. *c.* 10. *num.* 10. Likewiſe his Burial was put in perhaps as neceſſary of it ſelf to be known. But though it were not, yet hath it manifeſtly ſo neer relation to theſe that are neceſſary, (his Paſſion and Reſurrection, being the Conſequent of the one, and the Antecedent of the other,) that it is no marvel if for their ſakes it was put in. For though I verily believe that there is no neceſſary point of this nature, but

what is in the Creed, yet I do not affirm, becauſe I cannot prove it, that there is nothing in the Creed but what is neceſſary. You demand thirdly, *Why did they not expreſs Scriptures, Sacraments, and all Fundamental points of faith tending to practice, as well as thoſe which reſt in Belief?* I anſwer; Becauſe their purpoſe was to comprize in it only thoſe neceſſary points which reſt in belief: which appears, becauſe of practical points there is not in it ſo much as one.

77. We affirm, That if your Doctrin were true, this ſhort Creed, *viz. I believe the Roman Church to be Infallible*, would have been better, that is, more effectual to keep the believers of it from Hereſie, and in the true Faith, than this Creed which now we have. A propoſition ſo evident, that I cannot ſee how either you, or any of your Religion, or indeed any ſenſible man can from his heart deny it. Yet becauſe you make a ſhew of doing ſo, or elſe, which I rather hope, do not rightly apprehend the force of the Reaſon, I will endeavour briefly to add ſome light and ſtrength to it, by comparing the effects of theſe ſeveral ſuppoſed Creeds.

78. The former Creed therefore would certainly produce theſe effects in the believers of it: An impoſſibility of being in any formal Hereſie: A neceſſity of being prepared in mind to come out of all Error in Faith, or material Hereſie; which certainly you will not deny, or if you do, you pull down the only pillar of your Church and Religion, and deny that which is in effect the only thing you labour to prove through your whole Book.

79. The latter Creed which now we have, is ſo uneffectual for theſe good purpoſes, that you your ſelf tell us of innumerable, groſs, damnable Hereſies, that have been, are, and may be, whoſe contrary Truths are neither explicitly, nor by conſequence comprehended in this Creed: So that no man by the belief of this Creed without the former, can be poſſibly guarded from falling into them, and continuing obſtinate in them. Nay, ſo far is this Creed from guarding them from theſe miſchiefs, that it is more likely to enſnare them into them, by ſeeming and

yet

yet not being a full comprehenſion of all neceſſary points of Faith: which is apt (as experience ſhews,) to miſguide men into this pernitious error, That believing the Creed, they believe all neceſſary points of faith, whereas indeed they do not ſo. Now upon theſe grounds I thus conclude: That Creed which hath great commodities and no danger, would certainly be better then that which hath great danger, and wants many of theſe great commodities; But the former ſhort Creed propoſed by me, *I believe the Roman Church to be Infallible*, (if your doctrin be true,) is of the former condition, and the latter, that is, the Apoſtles Creed, is of the latter, Therefore the former (if your doctrin be true) would without controverſie be better than the latter.

83. Whereas you ſay, *If the Apoſtles had expreſt no Article but that of the Catholick Church, ſhe muſt have taught us the other Articles in particular by Creeds, or other means:* This is very true, but no way repugnant to the truth of this which follows, that the Apoſtles (if your doctrin be true) had done better ſervice to the Church, though they had never made this Creed of theirs which now we have, if inſtead thereof, they had commanded in plain terms that for mens perpetual direction in the faith, this ſhort Creed ſhould be taught all men, *I believe the Roman Church ſhall be for ever Infallible.* Yet you muſt not ſo miſtake me, as if I meant, that they had done better not to have taught the Church the ſubſtance of Chriſtian Religion; for then the Church not having learnt it of them, could not have taught it us. This therefore I do not ſay: but ſuppoſing they had written theſe Scriptures as they have written, wherein all the Articles of their Creed are plainly delivered, and preached that Doctrin which they did preach, and done all other things as they have done, beſides the compoſing their Symbol: I ſay, if your doctrin were true, they had done a work infinitely more beneficial to the Church of Chriſt, if they had never compoſed their Symbol, which is but an imperfect comprehenſion of the neceſſary points of ſimple belief, and no diſtinctive mark (as a Symbole ſhould be) between thoſe that are good Chriſtians, and thoſe that are not ſo; but

inſtead thereof, had delivered this one Propoſition, which would have been certainly effectual for all the aforeſaid good intents and purpoſes, *The Roman Church ſhall be forever Infallible in all things, which ſhe propoſes as matters of Faith.*

84. Whereas you ſay, *If we will believe we have all in the Creed, when we have not all, it is not the Apoſtles fault but our own:* I tell you plainly, if it be a fault, I know not whoſe it ſhould be but theirs. For ſure it can be no fault in me to follow ſuch Guides whether ſoever they lead me: Now I ſay, they have led me into this perſwaſion, becauſe they have given me great reaſon to believe it, and none to the contrary. The reaſon they have given me to believe it, is, becauſe it is apparent and confeſt, they did propoſe to themſelves in compoſing it, ſome good end or ends: As *that Chriſtians might have a form, by which* (for matter of Faith) *they might profeſs themſelves Catholicks, So* Putean *out of* Thomas Aquinas: *That the faithful might know, what the Chriſtian people is to believe explicitly, So* Vincent Filiucius: *That being ſeparated into divers parts of the world, they might preach the ſame thing: And that that might ſerve as a mark to diſtinguiſh true Chriſtians from Infidels, So Cardinal* Richlieu. Now for all theſe and for any other good intent, I ſay, it will be plainly uneffectual, unleſs it contain at leaſt all points of ſimple belief, which are in ordinary courſe, neceſſary to be explicitly known by all men. So that if it be a fault in me to believe this, it muſt be my fault to believe the Apoſtles, wiſe and good men: which I cannot do if I believe not this. And therefore what *Richardus de ſancto Victore* ſays of God himſelf, I make no ſcruple at all to apply to the Apoſtles, and to ſay, *Si error eſt quod credo, à vobis deceptus ſum:* If it be an Error which I believe, it is you, and my reverend eſteem of you and your actions that hath led me into it. For as for your ſuſpicion, *That we are led into this perſwaſion, out of a hope that we may the better maintain by it ſome opinions of our own,* It is plainly uncharitable. I know no opinion I have, which I would not as willingly forſake as keep, if I could ſee ſufficient reaſon to induce me to believe, that it is the will of God I

ſhould

ſhould forſake it. Neither do I know any opinion I hold againſt the Church of *Rome*, but I have more evident grounds than this whereupon to build it. For let but theſe Truths be granted: That the authority of the Scripture is independent on your Church, and dependent only in reſpect of us upon univerſal Tradition; That Scripture is the only Rule of Faith: That all things neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly delivered in Scripture: Let I ſay theſe moſt certain and divine Truths be laid for foundations, and let our ſuperſtructions be conſequent and coherent to them; and I am confident Peace would be reſtored, and Truth maintained againſt you, though the Apoſtles Creed were not in the world.

CHAP. V.

The ANSWER to the Fifth CHAPTER.

Shewing that the ſeparation of Proteſtants from the Roman Church, being upon juſt and neceſſary cauſes, is not any way guilty of Schiſm.

1. AD §. 1,2,3,4,5,6,7. In the ſeven firſt Sections of this Chapter, there be many things ſaid and many things ſuppoſed by you which are untrue, and deſerve a cenſure. As

2. Firſt, *That Schiſm could not be a Diviſion from the Church, or that a Diviſion from the Church could not happen, unleſs there always had been and ſhould be a viſible Church.* Which Aſſertion is a manifeſt falſehood: For although there never had been any Church Viſible or Inviſible before this age, nor ſhould be ever after, yet this could not hinder, but that a Schiſm might now be, and be a Diviſion from the preſent Viſible Church. As though in *France* there never had been until now a lawful Monarch, nor after him ever ſhould be, yet this hinders not, but that now there might be a Rebellion, and that Rebellion might be an Inſurrection againſt Sovereign Authority.

3. *That*

3. *That it is a point to be granted by all Chriſtians, that in all ages there hath been a viſible Congregation of faithful people.* Which Propoſition howſoever you underſtand it, is not abſolutely certain. But if you mean by *Faithful,* (as it is plain you do) *free from all error in faith,* then you know all Proteſtants with one conſent affirm it to be falſe; and therefore without proof to take it for granted is to beg the Queſtion.

4. *That ſuppoſing* Luther *and they which did firſt ſeparate from the Roman Church were guilty of Schiſm, it is certainly conſequent, that all who perſiſt in this diviſion muſt be ſo likewiſe.* Which is not ſo certain as you pretend. For they which alter without neceſſary cauſe the preſent government of any ſtate Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, do commit a great fault; whereof notwithſtanding they may be innocent who continue this alteration, and to the utmoſt of their power oppoſe a change though to the former ſtate, when continuance of time hath once ſetled the preſent. Thus have I known ſome of your own Church condemn the Low-country-men who firſt revolted from the King of *Spain,* of the ſin of Rebellion, yet abſolve them from it who now being of your Religion there, are yet faithful maintainers of the common liberty againſt the pretences of the King of *Spain.*

5. *That all thoſe which a Chriſtian is to eſteem neighbors do concur to make one company, which is the Church.* Which is falſe: for a Chriſtian is to eſteem thoſe his neighbors, who are not members of the true Church.

6. *That all the members of the Viſible Church, are by charity united into one Myſtical body.* Which is manifeſtly untrue; for many of them have no Charity.

7. *That the Catholick Church, ſignifies one company of faithful people,* which is repugnant to your own grounds. For you require not true faith, but only the Profeſſion of it, to make men members of the Viſible Church.

8. *That every Heretick is a Schiſmatick.* Which you muſt acknowledge falſe in thoſe, who though they deny, or doubt of ſome point profeſſed by your Church, and ſo are Hereticks: yet continue ſtill in the Communion of the Church.

9. *That*

9. *That all the members of the Catholick Church, muſt of neceſſity be united in external Communion.* Which though it were much to be deſired it were ſo, yet certainly cannot be perpetually true. For a man unjuſtly excommunicated, is not in the Churches Communion, yet he is ſtill a member of the Church: and divers times it hath happened, as in the caſe of *Chriſoſtom* and *Epiphanius*, that particular men, and particular Churches, have upon an overvalued difference, either renounced Communion mutually, or one of them ſeparated from the other, and yet both have continued members of the Catholick Church. Theſe things are in thoſe *ſeven Sections*, either ſaid or ſuppoſed by you untruly, without all ſhew, or pretence of proof. The reſt is an impertinent common place, wherein Proteſtants and the cauſe in hand, are abſolutely unconcerned. And therefore I paſs to the *eighth Section.*

10. Ad §. 8.] Here you obtrude upon us, a double fallacy; One, in ſuppoſing and taking for granted, that whatſoever is affirmed by *three Fathers*, muſt be true; whereas your ſelves make no ſcruple of condemning many things of falſehood, which yet are maintained, by more than thrice three Fathers. Another, in pretending their words to be ſpoken abſolutely, which by them are limited and reſtrained to ſome particular caſes. Thus the words of S. *Auſtin* (cap. 11. lib. 2. *cont. Parm.*) *That there is no neceſſity to divide Unity*; are not ſpoken abſolutely, that there never is, nor can be any neceſſity to divide Unity (which only were fo. your purpoſe) but only in ſuch a ſpecial caſe as he there ſets down: That is, *When good men tolerate bad men, which can do them no ſpiritual hurt, to the intent they may not be ſeparated from thoſe, who are ſpiritually good: Then* (ſaith he) *there is no neceſſity to divide Unity.* Which very words do clearly give us to underſtand, that it may fall out (as it doth in our caſe) that we cannot keep Unity with bad men, without ſpiritual hurt, *i. e.* without partaking with them in their impieties, and that then there is a neceſſity to divide Unity from them: I mean, to break off conjunction with them in their impieties. Which that it was S. *Auſtins* mind, it is moſt evident out of the 21. c. of the

the ſame book: where to *Parmenian* demanding, *how can a man remain pure, being joyned with thoſe that are corrupted?* He anſwers, *Very true, this is not poſſible, if he be joyned with them, that is, if he commit any evil with them, or favour them which do commit it. But if he do neither of theſe, he is not joyned with them.* And preſently after, *theſe two things retained, will keep ſuch men pure and uncorrupted; that is, neither doing ill, nor approving it.* And therefore ſeeing you impoſe upon all men of your Communion, a neceſſity of *doing* or at leaſt *approving* many things unlawful, certainly there lies upon us an unavoidable neceſſity of dividing Unity, either with you, or with God; and whether of theſe is rather to be done, be ye judges.

11. *Iræneus* alſo ſays not ſimply (which only would do you ſervice, (there cannot poſſibly be any ſo important Reformation, as to juſtifie a Separation from them who will not reform: But only, *they cannot make any corruption ſo great, as is the pernitiouſneſs of a Schiſm:* Now, *They*, here is a relative, and hath an antecedent expreſſed in *Iræneus*, which if you had been pleaſed to take notice of, you would eaſily have ſeen, that what *Irenæus* ſays, falls heavy upon the Church of *Rome*, but toucheth Proteſtants nothing at all. For the men he ſpeaks of are ſuch as *Propter modicas & quaſlibet cauſas, for trifling or ſmall cauſes, divide the body of Chriſt; ſuch as ſpeak of peace and make war; ſuch as ſtrain at Gnats, and ſwallow Camels. And theſe* ſaith he, *can make no reformation of any ſuch importance, as to countervail the danger of a diviſion.* Now ſeeing the cauſes of our ſeparation from the Church of *Rome*, are (as we pretend, and are ready to juſtify,) becauſe we will not be partakers with her in Superſtition, Idolatry, Impiety, and moſt cruel Tyranny, both upon the bodies and ſouls of men. Who can ſay, that the cauſes of our ſeparation, may be juſtly eſteemed *Modicæ & quælibet cauſæ?* On the other ſide, ſeeing the Biſhop of *Rome*, who was contemporary to *Irenæus*, did as much (as in him lay) cut off from the Churches unity, many great Churches, for not conforming to him in an indifferent matter, upon a difference, *Non de Catholico dogmate, ſed de Ritu, vel Ritus potiùs tempore, not about any Catholick Doctrin, but*

but only a Ceremony, or rather about the time of obſerving it; ſo *Petavius* values it: which was juſt all one, as if the Church of *France* ſhould excommunicate thoſe of their own Religion in *England*, for not keeping *Chriſtmas* upon the ſame day with them: And ſeeing he was reprehended ſharply and bitterly for it, by moſt of the Biſhops of the World, as * *Euſebius* teſtifies, and (as Cardinal *Perron* though mincing the matter, yet confeſſeth) by this very *Irenæus* himſelf in particular admoniſhed, that for ſo ſmall a cauſe (*propter tam modicam cauſam,*) he ſhould not have cut off ſo many Provinces from the Body of the Church: and laſtly, ſeeing the Eccleſiaſtical ſtory of thoſe times, mentions no other notable example of any ſuch Schiſmatical preſumption, but this of *Victor*: certainly we have great inducement to imagin, that *Irenæus* in this place by you quoted, had a ſpecial aim at the Biſhop and Church of *Rome*. Once, this I am ſure of, that the place fits him, and many of his ſucceſſors, as well as if it had been made purpoſely for them. And this alſo, that he which finds fault with them *who ſeparate upon ſmall cauſes*, implies clearly, that he conceived, their might be ſuch cauſes as were great and ſufficient: And that then a Reformation was to be made, notwithſtanding any danger of diviſion that might inſue upon it.

* *Euſeb. hiſt. l. 5. c. 24. Perron. Replic. l. 3. c. 2.*

12. Laſtly, S. *Denis* of *Alexandria*, ſays indeed and very well, *that all things ſhould be rather indured, than we ſhould conſent to the diviſion of the Church*: I would add, Rather than conſent to the continuation of the diviſion, if it might be remedied. But then, I am to tell you, that he ſays not All things ſhould rather *be done*, but only, All things ſhould rather *be indured or ſuffered*: wherein he ſpeaks not of the evil of Sin, but of Pain and Miſery: Not of tolerating either Error or Sin in others (though that may be lawful,) much leſs of joyning with others for quietneſs ſake, (which only were to your purpoſe) in the profeſſion of Error and practice of ſin: but of ſuffering any affliction, nay even Martyrdom in our own perſons, rather than conſent to the diviſion of the Church. *Omnia incommoda*, ſo your own *Chriſtophorſon*, enforced by

the circumſtances of the place, tranſlates *Dionyſius* his words, All *miſeries ſhould rather be endured, then we ſhould conſent to the Churches diviſion.*

13. Ad §. 9.] In this Paragraph you tell us firſt, *that the Doctrine of the total deficiency of the viſible Church, maintained by many chief* Proteſtants *implies in it vaſt abſurdity, or rather ſacrilegious Blaſphemy.*

Anſw. But neither do the *Proteſtants* alledged by you, maintain the deficiency of the Viſible Church, but only of the Churches Viſibility, or of the Church as it is viſible; neither do they hold that the Viſible Church hath failed totally from its eſſence, but only from its purity; and that it fell into many corruptions, but yet not to nothing. You ſay ſecondly, *that the Reaſon which caſt them upon this wicked Doctrine, was a deſperate voluntary neceſſity, becauſe they were reſolved not to acknowledge the* Roman *to be the true Church, and were convinced by all manner of evidence, that for diverſe Ages before* Luther *there was no other.* But this is not to diſpute but to Divine, and take upon you the property of God which is to know the Hearts of Men. For why I pray, might not the Reaſon hereof rather be, becauſe they were convinced by all manner of evidence, as Scripture, Reaſon, Antiquity, that all the Viſible Churches in the World, but above all the *Roman*, had degenerated from the purity of the Goſpel of Chriſt, and thereupon did conclude there was no Viſible Church, meaning by *no Church, none free from corruption*, and conformable in all things to the Doctrine of Chriſt.

14. Ad §. 10. Neither is there any repugnance (but in words only) between theſe (as you are pleaſed to ſtile them) *exterminating Spirits*, and thoſe other, whom out of courteſie you intitle, in your 10. §. *more moderate Proteſtants*. For theſe affirming the Perpetual Viſibility of the Church, yet neither deny, nor doubt of her being ſubject to manifold and grievous corruptions, and thoſe of ſuch a nature, as were they not mitigated by invincible, or at leaſt a very probable ignorance, none ſubject to them could be ſaved. And they on the other ſide, denying the Churches

Viſibility

Viſibility, yet plainly affirm, that they conceive very good hope of the Salvation of many, of their ignorant and honeſt Fore-fathers. Thus declaring plainly, though in words they denied the Viſibility of the true Church, yet their meaning was not to deny the perpetuity, but the perpetual purity and incorruption of the Viſible Church.

17. Ad §. 11.] You ask, *To what Congregation ſhall a man have recourſe for the affairs of his Soul; if upon Earth there be no viſible Church of Chriſt?*

Anſw. If ſome one Chriſtian lived alone among *Pagans* in ſome Country, remote from Chriſtendom, ſhall we conceive it impoſſible for this man to be ſaved, becauſe he cannot have recourſe to any Congregation for the affairs of his Soul? Will it not be ſufficient, for ſuch a ones Salvation, to know the Doctrine of Chriſt, and live according to it?

18. *Obj.* To *imagine a company of Men believing one thing in their Heart, and with their Mouth profeſſing the contrary (as they muſt be ſuppoſed to do, for if they had profeſſed what they believed, they would have become viſible) is to dream of a damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants, but not to conceive aright of the Church of Chriſt.* Anſw. What is this to the Viſibility of the Church? May not the Church be Inviſible, and yet theſe that are of it profeſs their Faith? No, ſay you: Their profeſſion will make them viſible. Very true, viſible in the places where, and in the times when they live, and to thoſe perſons, unto whom they have neceſſary occaſion, to make their profeſſion: But not viſible to all, or any great, or conſiderable part of the World while they live, much leſs conſpicuous to all Ages after them. Now it is a Church thus illuſtriouſly and conſpicuouſly viſible that you require: by whoſe ſplendour, all men may be directed and drawn to repair to her, for the affairs of their Souls: Neither is it the Viſibility of the Church abſolutely, but this degree of it, which the moſt rigid Proteſtants deny: which is plain enough out of the places of *Napper*, cited by you in your 9. Part. of this chapt. Where his words are, *God hath withdrawn his viſible Church from open Aſſemblies, to the Hearts of par-*

ticular godly men. And this Church which had not open Aſſemblies, he calls *The latent and Inviſible Church.* Now I hope *Papiſts* in *England* will be very apt to grant, men may be ſo far Latent and Inviſible, as not to profeſs their Faith in open Aſſemblies, nor to proclaim it to all the World, and yet not deny, nor diſſemble it; nor deſerve to be eſteemed a *damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants.*

Obj. *But Preaching of the Word, and adminiſtration of the Sacraments, cannot but make a Church Viſible: and theſe are inſeparable Notes of the Church.* I anſwer, they are ſo far inſeparable, that whereſoever they are, there a Church is: But not ſo, but that in ſome caſes there may be a Church, where theſe Notes are not. Again, theſe Notes will make the Church viſible: But to whom? certainly not to all men, nor to moſt men: But to them only to whom the Word is Preached, and the Sacraments are adminiſtred. They make the Church Viſible to whom themſelves are viſible, but not to others. As where your Sacraments are adminiſtred, and your Doctrine Preached, it is viſible, that there is a Popiſh Church. But this may perhaps be viſible to them only, who are preſent at theſe performances, and to others, as ſecret, as if they had never been performed.

20. Obj. *But S.* Auſtin *ſaith, it is an impudent, abominable, deteſtible ſpeech,* &c. *to ſay the Church hath Periſhed.* Anſw. 1. All that S. *Auſtin* ſays is not true. 2. Though this were true, it were nothing to your purpoſe, unleſs you will conceive it all one not to be, and not to be conſpicuouſly viſible. 3. This very ſpeech that the Church Periſhed, might be falſe and impudent in the *Donatiſts,* and yet not ſo in the Proteſtants. For there is no incongruity, that what hath lived 500. Years, may periſh in 1600.

21. Obj. *While Proteſtants deny the perpetuity of a viſible Church, they deſtroy their own preſent Church.* Anſw. I do not ſee, how the Truth of any preſent Church depends upon the perpetual Viſibility, nay nor upon the perpetuity of that which is paſt or future. For what ſenſe is there, that it ſhould not be in the power of God Almighty, to reſtore to a flouriſhing Eſtate, a Church which oppreſ-

ſion

ſion hath made Inviſible? to repair that which is ruined; to reform that which was corrupted, or to revive that which was dead? Nay what reaſon is there, but that by ordinary means this may be done, ſo long as the Scriptures by Divine Providence are preſerved in their integrity and Authority? As a Common-wealth though never ſo far collapſed and overrun with diſorders, is yet in poſſibility of being reduced unto its Original State, ſo long as the Ancient Laws, and Fundamental Conſtitutions are extant, and remain inviolate, from whence men may be directed how to make ſuch a Reformation. *But S.* Auſtin *urges this very Argument againſt the* Donatiſts, *and therefore it is good.* I anſwer, that I doubt much of the Conſequence, and my Reaſon is, becauſe you your ſelves acknowledge, that even general Councils (and therefore much more particular Doctors) though Infallible in their determinations, are yet in their Reaſons and Arguments, whereupon they ground them, ſubject to like Paſſions and Errors with other men.

22. *Obj.* Laſtly whereas you ſay, *That all Divines define Schiſm a Diviſion from the true Church,* and from thence collect, That *there muſt be a known Church from which it is poſſible for men to depart.* Anſwer, I might very juſtly queſtion your Antecedent, and deſire you to conſider, whether Schiſm be not rather, or at leaſt be not as well a diviſion of the Church, as from it? A ſeparation not of a part from the whole, but of ſome parts from the other. And if you liked not this definition, I might deſire you to inform me in thoſe many Schiſms, which have happened in the Church of *Rome,* which of the parts was the Church, and which was divided from it. But to let this paſs, certainly your conſequence is moſt unreaſonable. For though whenſoever there is a Schiſm, it muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe a Church exiſtent there, yet ſure we may define a Schiſm, that is, declare what the word ſignifies (for Defining is no more) though at this preſent there were neither Schiſm nor Church in the World. Unleſs you will ſay, that we cannot tell wat a Roſe is, or what the word Roſe ſignifies, but only in the Summer when we have Roſes: or

that

that in the World to come, when men ſhall not Marry, it is impoſſible to know, what it is to Marry: or that the Plague is not a Diſeaſe, but only when ſome Body is infected: or that Adultery is not a ſin, unleſs there be Adulterers: or that before *Adam* had a Child, he knew not, and God could not have told him, what it was to be a Father. Certainly Sir, you have forgot your Metaphyſicks, which you ſo much glory in, if you know not, that the connexions of eſſentiall predicates with their ſubjects, are Eternal, and depend not at all upon the actual exiſtence in the thing defined. This Definition therefore of Schiſm, concludes not the exiſtence of a Church, even when it is defined: much leſs the perpetual continuance of it, and leaſt of all the continuance of it in perpetual viſibility and purity, which is the only thing that we deny, and you are to prove.

23. Ad §. 12, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55. The remainder of this Chapter, offers Arguments to convince *Luther* and all that follow him to be Schiſmaticks.

24. Firſt then to prove us Schiſmaticks, you urge from the nature of Schiſm thus.

Whoſoever leave the external Communion of the viſible Church, are Schiſmaticks: But Luther *and his followers left the external Communion of the viſible Church of Chriſt: Therefore they are Schiſmaticks.*

The Minor or ſecond Propoſition of this Argument, you prove by two other. The firſt is this.

They which forſook the external Communion of all Viſible Churches, muſt needs forſake the external Communion of the true viſible Church of Chriſt. But Luther *and his followers forſook the external Communion of all Viſible Churches: Therefore they forſook the external Communion of the true viſible Church.*

The Second Argument ſtands thus.

The Roman *Church, when the ſeparation was made by* Luther, *&c. was the true Viſible Church of Chriſt.*

But Luther, *&c. forſook the external Communion of the* Roman *Church. Therefore they forſook the external Communion of the true Viſible Church of Chriſt.*

The

The Propoſition you confirm by theſe Reaſons.

1. *The* Roman *Church had the Notes of the Church aſſigned by* Proteſtants, *viz. The true Preaching of the Word, and due adminiſtration of Sacraments: Therefore ſhe was the true Church.*

2. *Either the* Roman *Church was the true viſible Church, or* Proteſtants *can name and prove ſome other diſagreeing from the* Roman, *and agreeing with* Proteſtants, *in their particular Doctrine: or elſe they muſt ſay there was no viſible Church: But they will not ſay, there was no Church: They cannot name and prove any other diſagreeing from the* Roman, *and agreeing with the* Proteſtants *in their particular Doctrines; becauſe this cannot be the* Greek *Church, nor that of the* Waldenſes, Wicklifites, Huſſites, *nor that of the* Muſcovites, Armenians, Georgians, Æthiopians, *(which you confirm by ſeveral Arguments:) Therefore they muſt grant, that the* Roman *Church was the true Viſible Church.*

25. Now to all this I briefly anſwer thus: That you have played the unwiſe builder, and erected a ſtately ſtructure upon a falſe Foundation. For whereas you take for granted as an undoubted Truth, *That whoſoever leave the external Communion of the viſible Church, are Schiſmatical,* I tell you Sir, you preſume too much upon us, and would have us grant, that which is the main point in Queſtion. For either you ſuppoſe the external Communion of the Church corrupted, and that there was a neceſſity for them, that would Communicate with this Church, to Communicate in her corruptions: Or you ſuppoſe her Communion uncorrupted. If the former, and yet will take for granted, that all are Schiſmaticks, that leave her Communion though it be corrupted, you beg the Queſtion in your propoſition. If the latter, you beg the Queſtion in your ſuppoſition, for *Proteſtants*, you know, are Peremptory and Unanimous in the Denial of both theſe things: Both that the Communion of the Viſible Church, was then uncorrupted; And that they are truly Schiſmaticks, who leave the Communion of the Viſible Church, if corrupted; eſpecially, if the caſe be ſo (and *Luthers* was ſo) that they muſt either leave her Communion

or

or of neceſſity Communicate with her in her corruptions.

26. Beſides although it were granted Schiſm, to leave the external Communion of the Viſible Church in what ſtate or caſe ſo ever it be, and that *Luther* and his followers were Schiſmaticks, for leaving the external Communion of all Viſible Churches: yet you fail exceedingly of clearing the other neceſſary point undertaken by you, *That the Roman Church was then the Viſible Church.* For neither do *Proteſtants* (as you miſtake) *make the true preaching of the Word, and due adminiſtration of the Sacraments, the notes of the Viſible Church,* but only of a Viſible Church: now theſe you know are very different things, the former ſignifying *the Church Catholick,* or the whole Church: the latter a *Particular Church,* or a part of the Catholick. And therefore ſuppoſe out of courteſie, we ſhould grant, what by argument you can never evince, that your Church had theſe notes, yet would it by no means follow, that your Church were *the Viſible Church,* but only *a Viſible Church:* not the whole Catholick, but only a part of it.

27. Laſtly, whereas *you ſay, that* Proteſtants *muſt either grant that your Church then was the Viſible Church, or name ſome other, diſagreeing from yours and agreeing with* Proteſtants *in their particular doctrin, or acknowledge there was no Viſible Church.* It is all one as if (to uſe S. *Pauls* ſimilitude) the head ſhould ſay to the foot, either you muſt grant that I am the whole body, or name ſome other member that is ſo, or confeſs that there is no body. To which the foot might anſwer; I acknowledge there is a body: and yet, that no member beſide you is this body: nor yet that you are it, but only a part of it. And in like manner ſay we. We acknowledge a Church there was, corrupted indeed univerſally, but yet ſuch a one as we hope by Gods gracious acceptance, was ſtill a Church. We pretend not to name any one Society that was this Church, and yet we ſee no reaſon, that can enforce us to confeſs that yours was the Church but only a part of it, and that one of the worſt then extant in the World. In vain therefore have you troubled your ſelf in proving, that we *cannot pretend, that either the Greeks, Waldenſes, Wickliffites, Huſſites, Muſcovites, Armenians, Georgians,*

Georgians, Abyſſines, were then the Viſible Church. For all this diſcourſe proceeds from a falſe & vain ſuppoſition, and begs another point in Queſtion between us, which is, that *ſome Church of one denomination and one Communion* (as the *Roman*, the *Greek*, &c.) *muſt be always*, excluſively to all other Communions, *the whole Viſible Church.* And though perhaps ſome weak *Proteſtant* having this falſe principle ſetled in him, that there was to be always ſome Viſible Church of one denomination, pure from all error in doctrin, might be wrought upon, and prevailed with by it, to forſake the Church of *Proteſtants*: yet why it ſhould induce him to go to yours, rather than the *Greek* Church, or any other, which pretends to perpetual ſucceſſion as well as yours, that I do not underſtand; unleſs it be for the reaſon which *Æneas Sylvius* gave, why more held the Pope above a Council, than a Council above the Pope: which was becauſe *Popes did give Biſhopricks, and Archbiſhopricks, but Councils gave none*, and therefore ſuing in *Forma Pauperis*,, were not like to have their cauſe very well maintained. For put the caſe, I ſhould grant of meer favour, that there muſt be always ſome Church of one Denomination and Communion, free from all errors in doctrin, and that Proteſtants had not always ſuch a Church: it would follow indeed from thence, that I muſt not be a Proteſtant: But that I muſt be a Papiſt, certainly it would follow by no better conſequence than this; if you will leave *England*, you muſt of neceſſity go to *Rome.* And yet with this wretched fallacy, have I been ſometimes abuſed my ſelf, and known many other poor ſouls ſeduced, not only from their own Church and Religion, but unto yours. I beſeech God to open the eyes of all that love the truth, that they may not always be held captive, under ſuch miſerable deluſions.

28. Let us come now to the Arguments which you build upon D. *Potters* own words, out of which you promiſe unanſwerable reaſons to convince Proteſtants of Schiſm.

29. But theſe reaſons will eaſily be anſwered, if the Reader will take along with him theſe three ſhort Memorandums.

30. Firſt, That not every ſeparation, but only a cauſeleſs ſeparation from the external Communion of any Church, is the Sin of Schiſm.

31. Secondly, That impoſing upon men under pain of Excommunication a neceſſity of profeſſing known errors, and practiſing known corruptions, is a ſufficient and neceſſary cauſe of ſeparation, and that this is the cauſe the Proteſtants alledge to juſtifie their ſeparation from which Church of *Rome*.

32. Thirdly, That to leave the Church, and to leave the external Communion of a Church, is not the ſame thing: That being done by ceaſing to be a member of it, by ceaſing to have thoſe requiſites which conſtitute a man a member of it, as faith and obedience: This by refuſing to communicate with any Church in her Liturgies and publick worſhip of God. This Armour if it be rightly placed, will repel all thoſe Batteries which you threaten us with all.

33. Ad §. 13. 14, 15.] The firſt is a ſentence of S. *Auſtin* againſt *Donatus*, applied to *Luther* thus. *If the Church periſhed, what Church brought forth* Donatus, *(you ſay* Luther?) *If ſhe could not periſh, what madneſs moved the ſect of* Donatus *to ſeparate, upon pretence to avoid the Communion of bad men?* Whereunto, one fair anſwer (to let paſs many others) is obvious out of the ſecond obſervation: That this ſentence though it were Goſpel, as it is not, is impertinently applied to *Luther* and *Lutherans*. Whoſe pretence of ſeparation (be it true or be it falſe, was not (as that of the *Donatiſts*,) only to avoid the Communion of bad men: but to free themſelves from a neceſſity (which but by ſeparating was unavoidable,) of joyning with bad men in their impieties.

34. Ad §. 16. Your ſecond onſet drives only at thoſe *Proteſtants*, who *hold the true Church was inviſible for many ages*. Which Doctrin (if by the *true Church* be underſtood, the *pure Church*, as you do underſtand it) is a certain truth, & it is eaſier for you to declaim (as you do) than to diſpute againſt it. But *theſe men you ſay muſt be Hereticks becauſe they ſeparated from the Communion of the Viſible Church: and there-*

therefore alſo from the Communion of that which they ſay was inviſible: In as much as the inviſible Church communicated with the viſible.

35. *Anſ.* I might very juſtly deſire ſome proof of that which ſo confidently you take for granted: That, there were no perſecuted and oppreſſed maintainers of the Truth in the days of our Fore-fathers, but only ſuch as diſſembled their opinions, and lived in your Communion. And truly if I ſhould ſay there were many of this condition, I ſuppoſe I could make my Affirmative much more probable, than you can make your Negative. We read in Scripture, that *Elias* conceived *there was none left beſides himſelf in the whole Kingdom of Iſrael*, who had not revolted from God: and yet God himſelf aſſures us that he was deceived. And if ſuch a man, a Prophet, and one of the greateſt, erred in his judgment touching his own time, and his own Country, why may not you, who are certainly but a man, and ſubject to the ſame paſſions as *Elias* was, miſtake in thinking, that in former ages, in ſome Countrey or other, there were not always ſome good Chriſtians, which did not ſo much as externally bow their knees to your *Baal*? But this anſwer I am content you ſhall take no notice of, and think it ſufficient to tell you, that if it be true, that this ſuppoſed inviſible Church did hypocritically communicate with the viſible Church, in her corruptions, then *Proteſtants* had cauſe, nay neceſſity, to forſake their Communion alſo, for otherwiſe they muſt have joyned with them in the practice of impieties: and ſeeing they had ſuch cauſe to ſeparate, they preſume their ſeparation cannot be Schiſmatical.

36. Yes, you reply, *to forſake the external Communion of them with whom they agree in faith, is the moſt formal and proper ſin of Schiſm. Anſw.* Very true, but I would fain know *wherein.* I would gladly be informed, whether I be bound for fear of Schiſm, to communicate with thoſe that believe as I do, only in lawful things, or abſolutely in every thing; whether I am to joyn with them in Superſtition and Idolatry, and not only in a common profeſſion of the Faith wherein we agree, but in a common diſſimula-

tion or abjuration of it. This is that which you would have them do, or elſe, forſooth, they muſt be Schiſmaticks. But hereafter I pray remember, that there is no neceſſity of communicating even with true Believers in wicked actions. Nay that there is a neceſſity herein to ſeparate from them. And then I dare ſay, even you being their judge, the reaſonableneſs of their cauſe to ſeparate ſhall, according to my firſt obſervation, juſtifie their ſeparation from being Schiſmatical.

37. Arg. *But the property of Schiſm according to D.* Potter *is to cut off from the hope of ſalvation, the Church from which it ſeparates: And theſe Proteſtants have this property, therefore they are Schiſmaticks.*

38. *Anſ.* I deny the Syllogiſm, it is no better than this: One Smptom of the Plague is a Feaver, but ſuch a man hath a Feaver, therefore he hath the Plague. The true concluſion which iſſues out of theſe Premiſſes, ſhould be this. Therefore he hath one Symptom of the plague. And ſo likewiſe in the former, therefore they have one property or one quality of Schiſmaticks. And as in the former inſtance, The man that hath one ſign of the plague, may by reaſon of the abſence of other requiſites, not have the plague: So theſe Proteſtants may have ſomething of Schiſmaticks, and yet not be Schiſmaticks. A Tyrant ſentencing a man to death for his pleaſure, and a juſt judge that condemns a malefactor, do both ſentence a man to death, and ſo for the matter do both the ſame thing: yet the one does wickedly, the other juſtly. What's the reaſon? becauſe the one hath cauſe, the other hath not. In like manner Schiſmaticks, either always or generally denounce damnation to them from whom they ſeparate. The ſame do theſe Proteſtants, & yet are not Schiſmaticks. The Reaſon: becauſe Schiſmaticks do it, and do it without cauſe, and Proteſtants have cauſe for what they do. The impieties of your Church, being, generally ſpeaking, damnable, unleſs where they are excuſed by ignorance, and expiated at leaſt by a general repentance. In fine, though perhaps it may be true, that all Schiſmaticks do ſo: yet univerſal affirmatives are not converted, and therefore it follows

follows not by any good Logick, that all that do ſo, when there is juſt cauſe for it, muſt be Schiſmaticks. The cauſe in this matter of ſeparation is all in all, and that for ought I ſee, you never think of. But *if theſe rigid Proteſtants have juſt cauſe to cut off your Church from the hope of ſalvation: How can the milder ſort allow hope of ſalvation to the Members of this Church? Anſ.* Diſtinguiſh the quality of the Perſons cenſured, and this ſeeming repugnance of their cenſures will vaniſh into nothing. For your Church may be conſidered either in regard of thoſe, in whom, either negligence, or pride, or worldly fear, or hopes, or ſome other voluntary ſin, is the cauſe of their ignorance, which I fear is the caſe of the generality of men amongſt you: or in regard of thoſe who owe their Errors from Truth, to want of capacity, or default of inſtruction; either in reſpect of thoſe that might know the truth and will not, or of thoſe who would know the truth but (all things conſidered) cannot: In reſpect of thoſe that have eyes to ſee, and will not ſee, or thoſe that would gladly ſee, but want eyes, or light. Conſider the former ſort of men, (which your more rigid cenſures ſeem eſpecially to reflect upon,) and the heavieſt ſentence will not be too heavy. Conſider the latter, and the mildeſt will not be too mild. So that here is no difference but in words only, neither are you flattered by the one, nor uncharitably cenſured by the other.

39. Your next blow is directed againſt the milder ſort of Proteſtants, *who you ſay involve themſelves in the ſin of Schiſm by communicating with thoſe (as you call them) exterminating Spirits, whom you conceive your ſelf to have proved Schiſmaticks:* And now load them further with the crime of Hereſie. For, ſay you, *if you held your ſelves obliged under pain of damnation, to forſake the Communion of the* Roman *Church by reaſon of her Errors, which yet you confeſs were not fundamental: ſhall it not be much more damnable, to live in confraternity with theſe, who defend an Error of the failing of the Church, which in the* Donatiſts *you confeſs to have been properly Heretical?*

40. *Anſ.* You miſtake in thinking that Proteſtants hold themſelves obliged not to communicate with you, only or prin-

principally by reaſon of your Errors and Corruption. For the true reaſon according to my third obſervation, is not ſo much becauſe you *maintain* Errors and Corruptions, as becauſe you *impoſe* them: and will allow your Communion to none but to thoſe that will hold them with you; and have ſo ordered your Communion, that either we muſt communicate with you in theſe things, or nothing. And for this very reaſon, though it were granted, that theſe Proteſtants held this Doctrin which you impute to them; And though this Error were as damnable and as much againſt the Creed as you pretend: Yet after all this, this diſparity between you and them, might make it more lawful for us to communicate with them than you: becauſe what they hold, they hold to themſelves, and refuſe not (as you do) to communicate with them that hold the contrary.

41. Thus we may anſwer your Argument, though both your former Suppoſitions were granted, But then for a ſecond anſwer, I am to tell you that there is no neceſſity of granting either of them. For neither do theſe Proteſtants hold the failing of the Church from its being, but only from its viſibility: which if you conceive all one, then muſt you conceive that the Stars fail every day, and the Sun every night. Neither is it certain that the Doctrin of the Churches failing is repugnant to the Creed. For as the truth of the Article of the Remiſſion of ſins, depends not upon the actual remiſſion of any mans ſins, but upon Gods readineſs and reſolution to forgive the ſins of all that believe and repent; ſo that, although unbelief or impenitence ſhould be univerſal, and *the Faithful ſhould* abſolutely *fail from the children of men*, and *the ſon of man ſhould find no faith on the earth*, yet ſhould the Article ſtill continue true, that God would forgive the ſins of all that repent: In like manner, it is not certain that the truth of the Article of the Catholick Church depends upon the actual exiſtence of a Catholick Church, but rather upon the right, that the Church of Chriſt, or rather (to ſpeak properly) the Goſpel of Chriſt hath to be univerſally believed. And therefore the Article may be true, though there

there were no Church in the world. In regard, this notwithſtanding, it remains ſtill true that there ought to be a Church, and this Church ought to be Catholick. For as, of theſe two Propoſitions, There is a Church in *America*, and, There ſhould be a Church in *America*, The truth of the latter depends not upon the truth of the former, ſo neither does it in theſe two: There is a Church diffuſed all the world over, and, There ſhould be a Church diffuſed all the world over.

44. Ad §. 17. The next Section in three long leaves delivers us this ſhort ſenſe. *That thoſe Proteſtants which ſay they have not left the Churches external Communion, but only her corruptions pretend to do that which is impoſſible. Becauſe theſe corruptions were inherent in the Churches external Communion: and therefore he that forſakes them cannot but forſake this.*

45. *Anſ.* But who are they that pretend, they forſook the Churches corruptions, and not her external communion? Some there be that ſay, they have not left the Church, that is, not ceaſed to be members of the Church, but only left her corruptions: ſome, that they have not left the communion, but the corruptions of it; meaning the internal communion of it, and conjunction with it by faith and obedience: which diſagree from the former only in the manner of ſpeaking: for he that is in the Church, is in this kind of communion with it: and he that is not in this internal communion, is not in the Church. Some perhaps, that they left not your external communion in all things; meaning, that they left it not voluntarily being not *fugitivi* but *fugati*, as being willing to joyn with you in any act of piety; but were by you neceſſitated & conſtrained to do ſo, becauſe you would not ſuffer them to do well with you, unleſs they would do ill with you. Now to do ill that you may do well, is againſt the will of God, which to every good man is a high degree of neceſſity. But for ſuch Proteſtants, as pretend that *de facto, they forſook your corruptions only and not your external communion*, that is, ſuch as pretend to communicate with you in your Confeſſions and Liturgies, and participation of Sacraments, I cannot but

Caſaubon in Ep. ad Card. Perron.

but doubt very much, that neither you nor I have ever met with any of this condition. And if perhaps you were led into error, by thinking that to leave the Church, and to leave the external communion of it, was all one in ſenſe and ſignification, I hope by this time you are diſabuſed, and begin to underſtand, that as a man may leave any faſhion or cuſtom of a Colledge, and yet remain ſtill a member of the Colledge; ſo a man may poſſibly leave ſome opinion or practice of a Church formerly common to himſelf and others, and continue ſtill a member of that Church: Provided that what he forſakes be not one of thoſe things wherein the eſſence of the Church conſiſts. Whereas peradventure this practice may be ſo involved with the external communion of this Church, that it may be ſimply impoſſible, for him to leave this practice, and not to leave the Churches external communion.

46. You will reply perhaps, *That the difficulty lies as well againſt thoſe who pretend to forſake the Churches corruptions and not the Church: as againſt thoſe who ſay, they forſook the Churches corruptions, and not her external communion. And that the reaſon is ſtill the ſame: becauſe theſe ſuppoſed corruptions, were inherent in the whole Church, and therefore by like reaſon with the former, could not be forſaken, but if the whole Church were forſaken.*

47. *Anſ.* A pretty Sophiſm, and very fit to perſwade men that it is impoſſible for them, to forſake any Error they hold, or any Vice they are ſubject to, either peculiar to themſelves, or in common with others: Becauſe forſooth, they cannot forſake themſelves, and Vices and Errors are things inherent in themſelves. The deceit lies, in not diſtinguiſhing between a Local and a Moral forſaking of any thing. For as it were an abſurdity, fit for the maintainers of Tranſubſtantiation to defend, that a man may locally and properly depart from the accidents of a ſubject, and not from the ſubject it ſelf: So is it alſo againſt reaſon to deny, that a man may (by an uſual phraſe of ſpeech) forſake any cuſtom, or quality, good or bad, either proper to himſelf, or common to himſelf with any company, and yet never truly or properly forſake either his company or himſelf.

himſelf. Thus if all the Jeſuites in the Society, were given to write Sophiſtically, yet you might leave this ill cuſtome, and yet not leave your Society. If all the Citizens of a City, were addicted to any vanity, they might either, all, or ſome of them forſake it, and yet not forſake the City. If all the parts of a mans Body were dirty or filthy, nothing hinders but that all or ſome of them might cleanſe themſelves, and yet continue parts of the Body. And what reaſon then in the World is there, if the whole viſible Church were overcome with Tares and Weeds of ſuperſtitions, and corruptions, but that ſome members of it might reform themſelves, and yet continue ſtill true members of the Body of the Church, and not be made no members, but the better by their Reformation?

50. We acknowledge, that we cannot (as matters now ſtand) *Separate from your corruptions, but we muſt depart from your External Communion.* For you have ſo ordered things, that whoſoever will Communicate with you at all, muſt Communicate with you, in your corruptions. But it is you that will not perceive the difference, between, being a part of the Church, and being in external Communion with all the other parts of it: taking for granted, that which is certainly falſe, that no two men or Churches, divided in external Communion, can be both true parts of the Catholick Church.

51. We are not *to learn the difference between* Schiſm *and* Hereſie, for *Hereſie* we conceive, an obſtinate defence of any Error, againſt any neceſſary Article of the Chriſtian Faith: And *Schiſm*, a cauſleſs ſeparation of one part of the Church from another. But this we ſay, That if we convince you of Errors and corruptions, profeſſed and practiſed in your Communion, then we cannot be Schiſmaticks, for refuſing to joyn with you in the profeſſion of theſe Errors, and the practice of theſe corruptions. And therefore you muſt free your ſelves from Error, or us from *Schiſm*.

52. Laſtly, whereas you ſay, *That you have demonſtrated againſt us, that* Proteſtants *divided themſelves from the*

external Communion of the Viſible Church, add, *which external communion was corrupted*, and we ſhall confeſs the accuſation, and glory in it. But this is not that *Quod erat demonſtrandum*, but that we divided our ſelves from the Church, that is, made our ſelves Out-laws from it, and no members of it. And moreover, in the Reaſon of your ſeparation from the external Communion of your Church you are miſtaken: for it was not ſo much becauſe ſhe, your Church, as becauſe your Churches external Communion was corrupted, and needed Reformation.

53. *That a pretence of Reformation will acquit no man from Schiſm*, we grant very willingly, and therefore ſay, that it concerns every man who ſeparates from any Churches Communion, even as much as his Salvation is worth, to look moſt carefully to it, that the cauſe of his ſeparation be juſt and neceſſary: For unleſs it be neceſſary, it can very hardly be ſufficient. But whether a true Reformation of our ſelves from Errors, ſuperſtitions and impieties, will not juſtifie our ſeparation in theſe things; our ſeparation, I ſay, from them who will not reform themſelves, and as much as in them lies, hinder others from doing ſo: This is the point you ſhould have ſpoken to, but have not. As for the ſentences of the Fathers to which you refer us, for the determination of this Queſtion, I ſuppoſe by what I have ſaid above, the Reader underſtands, by alledging them you have gained little credit to your cauſe or perſon. And that, if they were competent Judges of this Controverſie, their ſentence is againſt you much rather than for you.

56. But your Argument you conceive, will be more convincing, *if we conſider that when* Luther *appeared, there were not two diſtinct Viſible true Churches, one Pure, the other Corrupted, but one Church only.* *Anſ.* The ground of this is no way certain, nor here ſufficiently proved. For, whereas you ſay, Hiſtories are ſilent of any ſuch matter: I anſwer, there is no neceſſity, that you or I ſhould have read all Hiſtories, that may be extant of this matter; nor that all ſhould be extant that were written, much leſs extant uncorrupted: eſpecially conſidering your Church, which had

had lately all power in her hands, hath been ſo pernitiouſly induſtrious, in corrupting the monuments of Antiquity that made againſt her; nor that all Records ſhould remain which were written; nor that all ſhould be recorded which was done.

Laſtly, whereas you ſay, that ſuppoſing a viſible pure Church, *Luther* muſt be a Schiſmatick, who ſeparated from all viſible Churches: I tell you, if you will ſuppoſe a Viſible Church extant before and when *Luther* aroſe, conformable to him in all points of Doctrine, neceſſary and profitable, then *Luther* ſeparated not from this Church, but adjoyned himſelf to it: Not indeed in place, which was not neceſſary, not in external Communion which was impoſſible, but by the Union of Faith and Charity. Upon theſe grounds I ſay, that the ground of this Argument is no way made certain, yet becauſe it is not manifeſtly falſe, I am content to let it paſs. And for ought I ſee, it is very ſafe for me to do ſo: for you build nothing upon it, which I may not fairly grant. For what do you conclude from hence, but that ſeeing there was no Viſible Church but corrupted, *Luther* forſaking the external Communion of the corrupted Church, could not but forſake the external Communion of the Catholick Church? Well, let this alſo be granted, what will come of it? What, that *Luther* muſt be a Schiſmatick? By no means: For not every ſeparation, but only a cauſeleſs ſeparation from the Communion of the Church we maintain to be Schiſmatical. Hereunto may be added, that though the whole Church were corrupted, yet properly ſpeaking, it is not true, that *Luther* and his Followers forſook the whole corrupted Church, or the external Communion of it: But only that he forſook that Part of it which was corrupted, and ſtill would be ſo, and forſook not, but only reformed another Part, which Part they themſelves were, and I ſuppoſe you will not go about to perſuade us, that they forſook themſelves or their own Communion. And if you urge that they joyned themſelves to no other part, therefore they ſeparated from the whole: I ſay it follows not, in as much as themſelves were

a part of it, and still continued so: and therefore could no more separate from the whole than from themselves. Thus though there were no part of the People of *Rome*, to whom the *Plebeians* joyned themselves, when they made their Secession into the *Aventine Hill*, yet they divided themselves from the *Patricians* only, and not from the whole People, because themselves were a part of this People, and they divided not from themselves.

57. Ad §. 18.] Here you prove that which no man denies, that *corruption in manners yields no sufficient cause to leave the Church*: yet sure it yields sufficient cause to cast them out of the Church, that are after the Churches publick admonition obstinate in notorious impieties. Neither doth the cutting off such men from the Church, lay any necessity upon us, either to go out of the World, or out of the Church, but rather puts these men out of the Church into the World, where we may converse with them freely, without scandal to the Church, *Our Blessed Saviour foretold*, you say, *that there should be in the Church Tares with choice Corn.* Look again I pray, and you shall see, that the field he speaks of, is not the Church, but *the World*: and therefore neither doe You obey our Saviours command, *Let both grow up till the Harvest*, who teach it to be lawful to root these Tears (such are *Hereticks*) out of the World: neither do *Protestants* disobey it, if they eject manifest Heresies and notorious sinners out of the Church.

58. Ad §. 19.] In the 19. you are so courteous as to suppose *corruptions in your Doctrine*, and yet undertake to prove that, *neither could they afford us any sufficient cause, or colourable necessity to depart from them.* Your reason is, *because damnable Errors there were none in your Church, by D. Potters confession, neither can it be damnable in respect of Error, to remain in any Churches Communion, whose Errors are not damnable. For if the Error be not damnable, the belief thereof cannot.* Answ. *D. Potter* confesseth no such matter: but only that *he hopes that your Errors, though in themselves sufficiently damnable, yet by accident did not damn all that held them*: such he means and says, as were excusably ignorant

norant of Truth, and amongſt the number of their unknown ſins, repented daily of their unknown Errors. The truth is, he thinks as ill of your Errors and their deſert, as you do of ours: only he is not ſo peremptory and preſumptuous in judging your perſons, as you are in judging ours, but leaves them to ſtand or fall to their own Maſter, who is infinitely merciful, and therefore will not damn them for meer Errors, who deſire to find the truth and cannot: and withal infinitely juſt, and therefore (is it to be feared) will not pardon them, who might eaſily have come to the knowledge of the truth, and either through Pride, or obſtinacy, or neligence would not.

59. To your minor alſo, I anſwer almoſt in your own Words, §. 42. of this Chap. I thank you for your courteous ſuppoſal, that your Church may Err, and in recompence thereof, will do you a Charity, by putting you in mind, into what *Labyrinths* you caſt your ſelf, by ſuppoſing that the Church may Err in ſome of her Propoſals, and yet denying it lawful for any man though he know this, which you ſuppoſe, to oppoſe her judgment, or leave her communion. Will you have ſuch a man diſſemble againſt his Conſcience, or externally deny that which he knows true? No, that you will not, for them that do ſo, you your ſelf have pronounced *A damned Crew of diſſembling Sycophants.* Or would you have him continue in your Communion, and yet profeſs your Church to Err? This you your ſelves have made to him impoſſible. Or would you have him believe thoſe things true, which together with him you have ſuppoſed to be Errors? This in ſuch a one, as is aſſured or perſuaded of that, which you here ſuppoſe, that your Church doth Err, (and ſuch only we ſay, are obliged to forſake your Communion,) is, as Schoolmen ſpeak, *Implicatio in terminis*, a contradiction ſo plain, that one word deſtroyeth another; as if one ſhould ſay, a living dead man. For it is to require that they which believe ſome part of your Doctrine falſe, ſhould withal believe it all true. Seeing therefore, for any man to believe your Church in Error, and profeſs the contrary, is damnable Hypocriſie; to believe

lieve it and not believe it, a manifeſt repugnancy; and thirdly, to profeſs it and to continue in your Communion (as matters now ſtand) a plain impoſſibility; what remains, but that whoſoever is ſuppoſed to have juſt reaſon to disbelieve any Doctrine of your Church, muſt of neceſſity forſake her Communion? Unleſs you would remit ſo far from your preſent rigour, as to allow them your Churches Communion, who publickly profeſs that they do not believe every Article of her eſtabliſhed Doctrine. Indeed, if you would do ſo, you might with ſome coherence ſuppoſe your Church in Error, and yet find fault with men for abandoning her Communion, becauſe they might continue in it, and ſuppoſe her in Error. But to ſuppoſe your Church in Error, and to excommunicate all thoſe that believe your own ſuppoſition, and then to complain that they continue not in your Communion, is the moſt ridiculous incongruity that can be imagined. And therefore though your corruptions in Doctrine, in themſelves (which yet is falſe) did not, yet your obliging us, to profeſs your Doctrine uncorrupted againſt knowledge and Conſcience, may induce an obligation to depart from your Communion. As if there were any Society of Chriſtians, that held there were no Antipodes; notwithſtanding this Error I might communicate with them. But if I could not do ſo, without profeſſing my ſelf of their belief in this matter, then I ſuppoſe I ſhould be excuſed from Schiſm, if I ſhould forſake their Communion, rather than profeſs my ſelf to believe that which I do not believe. Neither is there any contradiction, or ſhadow of contradiction, that it may be neceſſary for my Salvation to depart from this Churches Communion: And that this Church (though Erring in this matter) wants nothing neceſſary to Salvation.

60. *That there might be neceſſary cauſe to depart from the Church of* Rome *in ſome Doctrine and practices, though ſhe wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation as Dr.* Potter holds, and you call a contradiction, will appear by ſetting down his Words, which are theſe; *To forſake the Errors of that Church, and not to joyn with her in thoſe practices which we account*

account erroneous, we are enforced by neceſſity. For though in the iſſue they are not damnable to them which believe as they profeſs, yet for us to profeſs and avow by Oath (as the Church of Rome *enjoyns) what we believe not, were without queſtion damnable. And they with their Errors, by the grace of God might go to Heaven, when we for our Hypocriſie and diſſimulation* (he might have added, and Perjury) *ſhould certainly be condemned to Hell.*

61. Ad §. 20.] *Obj.* But *a Church not Erring in Fundamentals, though Erring in other matters, doth what our Saviour exacts at her hands, doth as much as lies in her power to do: Therefore the Communion of ſuch a Church is not upon pretence of Error to be forſaken.* The conſequence is manifeſt. The Antecedent is proved, becauſe *God, by D.* Potters *confeſſion, hath promiſed his aſſiſtance no further, nor is it in her power to do more than God doth aſſiſt her to do.* Pag. 151. 155.

Anſw. The promiſe of Divine Aſſiſtance is twofold: Abſolute, or Conditional. That there ſhall be by Divine providence preſerved in the World to the Worlds end, ſuch a company of Chriſtians, who hold all things preciſely and indiſpenſably neceſſary to Salvation, and nothing inevitably deſtructive of it: This and no more the Doctor affirms that God hath promiſed abſolutely. Yet he neither doubts nor denys, but that a farther aſſiſtance is conditionally promiſed us, even ſuch an aſſiſtance as ſhall lead us, if we be not wanting to it and our ſelves, into all not only neceſſary, but very profitable truth, and guard us from all not only deſtructive, but alſo hurtful Errors. This, I ſay, he neither denies nor queſtions. And ſhould he have done ſo, he might have been confuted by evident and expreſs Texts of Scripture. When therefore you ſay, That *a Church not Erring in Fundamentals, doth as much as by Gods aſſiſtance lies in her power to do*; This is manifeſtly untrue. For Gods aſſiſtance is alwaies ready to promote her farther. It is ready, I ſay, but on condition the Church does implore it: on condition, that when it is offerred in the Divine directions of Scripture and reaſon, the Church be not negligent to follow it. If therefore there be any Church, which retaining the foundation,

builds

builds *Hay and Stubble* upon it: which believing what is preciſely neceſſary, Errors ſhamefully and dangerouſly in other things very profitable: This by no means argues defect of Divine aſſiſtance in God, but neglect of this aſſiſtance in the Church. Neither is there any reaſon, why ſuch a Church ſhould pleaſe her ſelf too much, for retaining Fundamental truths, while ſhe remains ſo regardleſs of others. For though the ſimple defect of ſome truths profitable only and not ſimply neceſſary, may conſiſt with Salvation; Yet who is there that can give her ſufficient aſſurance, that the neglect of ſuch truths is not damnable? Beſides, who is there that can put her in ſufficient caution, that theſe Errors about profitable matters may not according to the uſual fecundity of Error, bring forth others of a higher quality, ſuch as are pernitious and peſtilent, and undermine by ſecret conſequences the very foundations of Religion and Piety? Laſtly, who can ſay that ſhe hath ſufficiently diſcharged her duty to God and man by avoiding only Fundamental Hereſies, if in the mean time ſhe be negligent of others, which though they do not plainly deſtroy Salvation, yet obſcure and hinder, and only not block up the way to it? Which though of themſelves and immediately they damn no man, yet are cauſes and occaſions that many men run the race of Chriſtian Piety more remiſly than they ſhould, many defer their repentance, many go on ſecurely in their ſins, and ſo at length are damned by means and occaſion of theſe Errors, though not for them. Such Errors as theſe (though thoſe of the *Roman Church* be much worſe, even *in themſelves damnable, and by accident only pardonable*) yet I ſay ſuch Errors as theſe, if any Church ſhould tolerate, diſſemble and ſuffer them to reign, and neglect to reform them, and not permit them to be freely, yet peaceably, oppoſed and impugned; will any wiſe man ſay, that ſhe hath ſufficiently diſcharged her duty to God and man? That ſhe hath with due fidelity diſpenſed the Goſpel of Chriſt? That ſhe hath done what ſhe could, and what ſhe ought? What ſhall we ſay then, if theſe Errors be taught by her, and commanded to be taught? What if ſhe thunder

der out her curſes againſt thoſe that will not believe them? What if ſhe rave and rage againſt them, and perſecute them with Fire and Sword, and all kinds of moſt exquiſite torments? Truly I do much fear, that from ſuch a Church (though it hold no Error abſolutely unconſiſtent with Salvation,) the Candleſtick of God, either is already removed, or will be very ſhortly, and becauſe ſhe is negligent of profitable truths, that ſhe will loſe thoſe that are Neceſſary, and becauſe ſhe will not be led into all truths, that in ſhort time ſhe ſhall be led into none. And although this ſhould not happen, yet what mortal man can ſecure us, that not only a probable unaffected ignorance, nor only a meer neglect of profitable truths, but alſo a wretchleſs ſupine negligence, manifeſt contempt, Diſſimulation, Oppoſition, Oppreſſion of them, may conſiſt with Salvation? I truly for my part, though I hope very well of all ſuch as ſeeking all truth, find that which is neceſſary; who endeavouring to free themſelves from all Errors, any way contrary to the purity of Chriſtianity, yet fail of performance and remain in ſome: yet if I did not find in my ſelf a love and deſire of all profitable truth; If I did not put away idleneſs, and prejudice, and worldly affections, and ſo examine to the bottom all my opinions of Divine matters, being prepared in mind to follow God, and God only which way ſoever he ſhall lead me; If I did not hope, that I either do, or endeavour to do theſe things, certainly I ſhould have little hope of obtaining Salvation.

62. Obj. *But to oblige any man under pain of damnation to forſake a Church by reaſon of ſuch Errors, againſt which Chriſt thought it ſuperfluous to promiſe his aſſiſtance, and for which he neither denies his grace here, nor his glory hereafter, what is it but to make the narrow way to Heaven, narrower than Chriſt left it? Anſw.* It is not: for Chriſt himſelf hath obliged us hereunto: He hath forbidden us under pain of damnation to profeſs what we believe not, and conſequently under the ſame penalty, to leave that Communion, in which we cannot remain without this hypocritical profeſſion of thoſe things, which we are convinced to be

erroneous. But then beſides, it is here falſely ſuppoſed, (as hath been ſhewed already) that Chriſt hath not promiſed aſſiſtance to thoſe that ſeek it, but only in matters ſimply neceſſary. Neither is there any reaſon, why any Church, even in this World, ſhould deſpair of Victory over all Errors pernitious or noxious; provided ſhe humbly and earneſtly implore Divine aſſiſtance, depend wholly upon it, and be not wanting to it. Though a *Triumph over all ſin and Error*, that is, ſecurity that ſhe neither doth nor can Err, be rather to be deſired than hoped for on Earth, being a felicity reſerved for Heaven.

63. Ad §. 21.] Obj. *But at leaſt the* Roman *Church is as infallible as* Proteſtants, *and* Proteſtants *as fallible as the* Roman *Church: therefore to forſake the* Roman *Church for Errors, what is it but to flit from one Erring Society to another? Anſ.* The inconſequence of this Argument is too apparent: *Proteſtants* may Err as well as the Church of *Rome*, therefore they did ſo! Boys in the Schools know, that *à Poſſe ad Eſſe*, the Argument follows not. He is equally fallible that believes twiſe two to be four, as he that believes them to be twenty: yet in this, he is not equally deceived, and he may be certain that he is not ſo. One Architect is no more infallible than another, and yet he is more ſecure that his work is right and ſtreight who hath made it by the level, than he which hath made it by gueſs and by chance. So he that forſakes the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, and therefore renounceth her Communion, that he may renounce the profeſſion of her Errors, though he knows himſelf fallible, as well as thoſe whom he hath forſaken, yet he may be certain (as certain as the nature of the thing will bear) that he is not herein deceived: becauſe he may ſee the Doctrine forſaken by him repugnant to Scripture, and the Doctrine embraced by him conſonant to it. At leaſt, this he may know, that the Doctrine which he hath choſen to him ſeems true, and the contrary which he hath forſaken, ſeems falſe: And therefore without remorſe of Conſcience, he may profeſs that, but this he cannot.

46. *Obj.*

64. *Obj.* But *we are to remember, that according to Doctor* Potter *the Visible Church hath a blessing not to Err in Fundamentals, in which any private Reformer may fail, therefore there was no necessity of forsaking the Church, out of whose Communion they were exposed to danger of falling into many more, and even into damnable Errors. Answ.* The Visible Church is free indeed from all Errors absolutely destructive and unpardonable, but not from all Error which in it self is damnable: not from all which will actually bring damnation upon them, that keep themselves in them, by their own voluntary and avoidable fault.

Besides, any private man who truly believes the Scripture, and seriously endeavours to know the will of God, and to do it, is as secure as the Visible Church, more secure than your Church from the danger of Erring in Fundamentals: for it is impossible, that any man so quallified should fall into any Error which to him will prove damnable. For God requires no more of any man to his Salvation, but his true endeavour to be saved. Lastly, abiding in your Churches Communion is so far from securing me or any man from damnable Error, that if I should abide in it, I am certain I could not be saved. For abide in it I cannot, without professing to believe your entire Doctrine true: profess this I cannot, but I must lie perpetually, and exulcerate my Conscience. And though your Errors were not in themselves damnable, yet to resist the known Truth, and to continue in the profession of known Errors and falshoods, is certainly a capital sin, and of great affinity with the sin which shall never be forgiven.

65. Obj. *But neither is the* Protestant *Church free from corruptions and Errors: And what man of Judgment will be a* Protestant, *since that Church is confessedly a corrupted one?*

Answ. And yet you your self make large discourses in this very Chapter, to perswade *Protestants* to continue in the Church of *Rome*, though supposed to have some corruptions. And why I pray, may not a man of judgment continue in the Communion of a Church confessedly corrupted, as well as in a Church supposed to be corrupted? Especially when this Church supposed to be corrupted, re-

quires the belief and profeſſion of her ſuppoſed corruptions, as the condition of her Communion: which this Church confeſſedly corrupted, doth not. What man of judgment will think it any diſparagement, to his judgment, to prefer the better, though not ſimply the beſt, before that which is ſtark naught? To prefer indifferrent good health, before a diſeaſed and corrupted ſtate of Body? To prefer a field not perfectly weeded, before a field that is quite over-run with Weeds and Thorns? and therefore though *Proteſtants* have ſome Errors, yet ſeeing they are neither ſo great as yours, nor impoſed with ſuch Tyranny, nor maintained with ſuch obſtinacy; he that conceives it any diſparagement to his judgment, to change your Communion for theirs, though confeſſed to have ſome corruptions, it may well be preſumed that he hath but little judgment.

66. Ad §. 22.] Obj. *But* Proteſtants *ſay, it is comfort enough for the Church to be ſecured from all capital dangers (which can only ariſe from Error in Fundamental points) and not hope to Triumph over all ſin and Error, till ſhe be in Heaven; why therefore were not the firſt Reformers content with enough, but would diſmember the Church, out of greedineſs of more than enough?*

Anſw. I have already ſhewed ſufficiently, how capital danger may ariſe from Errors, though not Fundamental. I add now, that what may be enough for men in ignorance, may be to knowing men not enough: according to that of the Goſpel, *to whom much is given, of him much ſhall be required:* That the ſame Error may be not capital to thoſe who want means of finding the truth, and capital to others who have means, and neglect to uſe them: That to continue in the profeſſion of Error diſcovered to be ſo, may be damnable, though the Error be not ſo. Theſe I preſume are reaſons enough, and enough why the firſt Reformers might think, and juſtly, that not enough for themſelves, which yet to ſome of their Predeceſſors they hope might be enough. This very Argument was objected to [a] S. *Cyprian* upon another occaſion,

[a] *S. Cyprian: Ep.* 63. In theſe words. *Siquis de anteceſſoribus noſtris, vel ignoranter vel ſimpliciter non hoc obſervavit, & tenuit quod nos Dominus facere exemplo & Magiſterio ſuo docuit, poteſt ſimplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini, venia concedi: nobis verò non poteſt ignoſci, qui nunc à Domino admoniti & inſtructi ſumus.*

ſion, and alſo by the [b] Brittiſh *Quartodecimans*, to the maintainers of the Doctrine of your Church; and [c] by both this very anſwer was returned; and therefore I cannot but hope that for their ſakes you will approve it.

[b] *Wilfridus*, to *Abbat Colman* alledging that he followed the example of his predeceſſors famous for Holineſs, and famous for Miracles, in theſe Words, *De Patre Veſtro Columba & ſequacibus ejus, quorum ſantitatem vos imitari & regulam ac præcepta cæleſtibus ſignis confirmata ſequi perhibetis, poſſum reſpondere; Quia multi in judicio dicentibus Domino Quòd in nomine ejus prophetaverint & dæmonia ejecerint, & virtutes multas fecerint, reſponſurus ſit Dominus, quia nunquam eos noverit. Sed abſit ut de patribus veſtris hoc dicam, quia juſtius multo eſt de incognitis bonum credere quam malum. Unde & illos Dei famulos & Deo dilectos eſſe non nego, qui ſimplicitate ruſticâ, ſed intentione piâ Deum dilexerunt: Neque illis multum obeſſe Paſchæ talem reor obſervantiam, quandiu nullus advenerat qui eis inſtituti perfectioris decreta quæ ſequerentur, oſtenderet. Quos utique credo, ſi qui tunc ad eos Catholicus calculator adveniret, ſic ejus monita fuiſſe ſecuturos, quomodo ea quæ noverant ac didicerunt Dei mandata, probantur fuiſſe ſecuti. Tu autem & ſocii tui ſi audita decreta ſedis Apoſtolicæ, imo univerſalis Eccleſiæ & hæc literis ſacris confirmata contemnitis, abſque ulla dubietate peccatis.* [c] Beda: *lib.* 3. *Eccl. Hiſt. c.* 25.

67. Obj. *But if no Church may hope to Triumph over Error, till ſhe be in Heaven, then we muſt either grant, that Errors not Fundamental cannot yield ſufficient cauſe to forſake the Church, or affirm that all communities may and ought to be forſaken.*

Anſw. We do not ſay, that no Church may hope to be free from all Error, either pernitious or any way noxious: But that *no Church may hope to be ſecure from all Error ſimply*, for this were indeed truly to triumph over all. But then we ſay not, that the Communion of any Church is to be forſaken for Errors unfundamental, unleſs it exact with all either a diſſimulation of them being noxious; or a Profeſſion of them againſt the dictate of Conſcience, if they be meer Errors. This if the Church does (as certainly yours doth,) then her Communion is to be forſaken, rather than the ſin of Hypocriſie to be committed. Whereas to forſake the Churches of *Proteſtants* for ſuch Errors, there is no neceſſity, becauſe they Err to themſelves, and do not under pain of Excommunication exact the profeſſion of their Errors.

68. Obj. *But the Church may not be left by reaſon of ſin, therefore neither by reaſon of Errors not Fundamental: in as much*

much as both sin and Error are impossible to be avoided till she be in Heaven. *Answ.* The reason of the consequence does not appear to me: But I answer to the Antecedent: Neither for sin or Errors, ought a Church to be forsaken, if she does not impose and joyn them: but if she do, (as the *Roman* does,) then we must forsake men rather than God; leave the Churches Communion rather than commit sin, or profess known Errors, to be Divine truths. For the Prophet *Ezekiel* hath assured us, that to say, *the Lord hath said so, when the Lord hath not said so,* is a great sin and a high presumption, be the matter never so small.

69. Ad §. 23.] Obj. *But neither the Quality nor the number of your Churches Errors, could warrant our forsaking of it. Not the Quality, because we suppose them not Fundamental. Not the number because the Foundation is strong enough to support them.* *Answ.* Here again you vainly suppose, that we conceive your Errors in themselves not damnable: Though we hope they are not absolutely unpardonable: but to say they are pardonable, is indeed to suppose them damnable. Secondly, though the Errors of your Church did not warrant our departure, yet your Tyrannous imposition of them, would be our sufficient justification. For this lays necessity on us, either to forsake your company, or to profess what we know to be false.

70. Obj. *Our Blessed Saviour hath declared his Will, that we forgive a private offender Seventy Seven times, that is, without limitation of quantity of time, or quality of Trespasses; and then how dare we alledge his command, that we must not pardon his Church for Errors acknowledged to be not Fundamental?* *Answ.* He that commands us to pardon our Brother sinning against us so often, will not allow us for his sake to sin with him, so much as once. He will have us do any thing but sin, rather than offend any man. But his will is also, that we offend all the World, rather than sin in the least matter. And therefore though his will were, and it were in our power (which yet is false) to pardon the Errors of an Erring Church; yet certainly it is not his will, that we should Err with the Church, or if we do

not,

not, that we ſhould againſt Conſcience profeſs the Errors of it.

71. Ad §. 24.] Obj. *But Schiſmaticks from the Church of* England *or any other Church, with this very Anſwer, that they forſake not the Church but the Errors of it, may caſt off from themſelves the imputation of Schiſm.* Anſw. True, they may make the ſame Anſwer, and the ſame defence as we do, as a Murtherer can cry not guilty, as well as an Innocent perſon, but not ſo truly nor ſo juſtly. The queſtion is, not what may be pretended, but what can be proved by Schiſmaticks. They may object Errors to other Churches, as well as we do to yours, but that they prove their accuſation ſo ſtrongly as we can, that appears not. To the Prieſts and Elders of the *Jews*, impoſing that ſacred ſilence mentioned in the *Acts* of the Apoſtles, S. *Peter* and S. *John* anſwered *they muſt obey God rather than men.* The three Children to the King of *Babylon*, gave in effect the ſame anſwer. Give me now any factious Hypocrite, who makes Religion the pretence and Cloke of his Rebellion, and who ſees not that ſuch a one may anſwer for himſelf, in thoſe very formal words, which the Holy Apoſtles and Martyrs made uſe of. And yet I preſume no Chriſtian will deny, but this anſwer was good, in the mouth of the Apoſtles and Martyrs, though it were obnoxious to be uſed, by Traitors and Rebels. Certainly therefore, it is no good conſequence to ſay, Schiſmaticks may make uſe of this Anſwer, therefore all that do make uſe of it are Schiſmaticks. But moreover, it is to be obſerved, that the cheif part of our defence, that you deny your Communion to all that deny or doubt of any part of your Doctrine, cannot with any colour be imployed againſt *Proteſtants*: who grant their Communion to all who hold with them, not all things, but things neceſſary, that is, ſuch as are in Scripture plainly delivered.

72. Obj. *But the forſaking the* Roman *Church opens a way to innumerable Sects and Schiſms, and therefore it muſt not be forſaken.* *Anſw.* We muſt not do evil to avoid evil: neither are all courſes preſently lawful, by which inconveniencies may be avoided. If all men would ſubmit them-

themſelves to the chief Mufty of the *Turks*, it is apparent, there would be no diviſions; yet Unity is not to be purchaſed at ſo dear a rate. It were a thing much to be deſired, that there were no diviſions: yet difference of opinions touching points controverted, is rather to be choſen, than unanimous concord in damned Errors: As it is better for men to go to Heaven by diverſe ways, or rather by divers Paths of the ſame way, than in the ſame path to go on peaceably to Hell. *Amica Pax, magis amica Veritas!* Peace is dear to me, but Truth is dearer.

74. Ad §. 26. 27.] Here you make D. *Potter* to ſay, *that Proteſtants did well to forſake the Church of* Rome, *becauſe they judged ſhe retained all means neceſſary to Salvation. Anſw.* Who was ever ſo ſtupid as to give this ridiculous reaſon? D. *Potter* Vindicates *Proteſtants* for Schiſm two ways: The one is, becauſe they had juſt and great and neceſſary cauſe to ſeparate, which Schiſmaticks never have; becauſe they that have it are no Schiſmaticks: For Schiſm is always a cauſeleſs ſeparation. The other is, becauſe they did not joyn with their ſeparation, an uncharitable damning of all thoſe from whom they did divide themſelves, as the manner of Schiſmaticks is. Now that which he intends for a circumſtance of our ſeparation, you make him make the cauſe of it, and the motive to it. And whereas he ſays, *though we ſeparate from you in ſome things, yet we acknowledge your Church a member of the Body of Chriſt, and therefore are not Schiſmaticks:* You make him ſay moſt abſurdly, *we did well to forſake you, becauſe we judged you a member of the Body of Chriſt.* Juſt as if a Brother ſhould leave his Brothers company in ſome ill courſes, and ſhould ſay to him, Herein I forſake you, yet I leave you not abſolutely, for I acknowledge you ſtill to be my Brother, and ſhall uſe you as a Brother: And you perverting his ſpeech, ſhould pretend that he had ſaid, I leave your company in theſe ill courſes, and I do well to do ſo, becauſe you are my Brother: ſo making that the cauſe of his leaving him, which indeed is the cauſe that he left him no farther.

75. Obj. But you ſay, *The very reaſon for which he acquitteth himſelf for Schiſm, is becauſe he holds that the Church*

Church which they forſook, is not cut off from the Body of Chriſt.

Anſ. This is true: But can you not perceive a difference between juſtifying his ſeparation from Schiſm by this reaſon, and making this the reaſon of his ſeparation? If a man denying obedience in ſome unlawful matter to his lawful Sovereign, ſhould ſay to him, herein I diſobey you, but yet I am no Rebel, becauſe I acknowledge you my Sovereign Lord, and am ready to obey you in all things lawful, ſhould not he be an egregious Sycophant, that ſhould accuſe him as if he had ſaid, I do well to diſobey you, becauſe I acknowledge you my lawful Soveraign? Certainly he that joyns this acknowledgment with his neceſſitated diſobedience, does well; but he that makes this conſideration the reaſon of his diſobedience, doth ill.

76. Obj. *It is an unſpeakable comfort to Catholicks* (you ſay) *that we cannot clear our ſelves from Schiſm otherwiſe, than by acknowledging that* we do *not, nor cannot cut off your Church from the hope of ſalvation.*

Anſ. I beſeech you to take care that this falſe comfort coſt you not too dear. For why this good opinion of God Almighty, that he will not damn men for error, who were without their own fault ignorant of the truth, ſhould be any conſolation to them, who having the key of knowledge, will neither uſe it themſelves, nor permit others to uſe it; who have eyes to ſee and will not ſee, who have ears to hear and will not hear! this I aſſure you paſſeth my capacity to apprehend. Neither *is this to make our ſalvation depend on yours,* but only ours and yours not deſperatly inconſiſtent. Nor to ſay we *muſt be damned unleſs you may be ſaved*; but that we aſſure our ſelves, if our lives be anſwerable, we ſhall be ſaved by our knowledge. And that we hope (and I tell you again *Spes eſt rei incertæ nomen,*) that ſome of you may poſſibly be the rather ſaved by occaſion of their unaffected Ignorance.

80. Ad §. 28. 29. Whereas D. *Potter ſays, There is a great difference between a Schiſm from them, and a Reformation of our ſelves: this* you ſay *is a quaint ſubtilty by which all Schiſm and ſin may be as well excuſed.*

Anſ. It ſeems then in your judgment, that Thieves and Adulterers, and Murtherers, and Traytors may ſay with as much probability as Proteſtants, that they did no hurt to others, but only reform themſelves. But then methinks it is very ſtrange, that all Proteſtants ſhould agree with one conſent in this defence of themſelves from the imputation of Schiſm: and that to this day, never any Thief or Murtherer ſhould have been heard of to make uſe of this Apology! And then for Schiſmaticks I would know, whether *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, who excommunicated the Churches of *Aſia* for not conforming to his Church in keeping *Eaſter*; whether *Novatian* that divided from *Cornelius*, upon pretence that himſelf was elected Biſhop of *Rome*, when indeed he was not; whether *Feliciſſimus* and his Crew, that went out of the Church of *Carthage*, and ſet up altar againſt altar, becauſe having fallen in perſecution, they might not be reſtored to the peace of the Church preſently, upon the interceſſion of the Confeſſors; whether the *Donatiſts*, who divided from, and damned all the world, becauſe all the world would not excommunicate them who were accuſed only and not convicted to have been Traditors of the ſacred Books; whether they which for the ſlips and infirmity of others, which they might and ought to tolerate, or upon ſome difference in matters of Order and Ceremony, or for ſome error in Doctrin, neither pernitious nor hurtful to faith or piety, ſeparate themſelves from others, or others from themſelves; or laſtly, whether they that put themſelves out of the Churches unity and obedience, becauſe their opinions are not approved there, but reprehended and confuted, or becauſe being of impious converſation, they are impatient of their Churches cenſure: I would know I ſay, whether all, or any of theſe, may with any face or without extream impudency, put in this plea of Proteſtants, and pretend with as much likelihood as they, that they did not ſeparate from others, but only reform themſelves? But ſuppoſe they were ſo impudent as to ſay ſo in their own defence falſely, doth it follow by any good Logick, that therefore this Apology is not to be imployed by Proteſtants, who may ſay

ſo

ſo truly? *We make* (ſay they) *no Schiſm from you, but only a reformation of our ſelves: This*, you reply, *is no good juſtification, becauſe it may be pretended by any Schiſmatick.* Very true, any Schiſmatick that can ſpeak may ſay the ſame words, (as any Rebel that makes conſcience the cloak of his impious diſobedience; may ſay with S. *Peter* and S. *John, we muſt obey God rather than men*;) But then the queſtion is, whether any Schiſmatick may ſay ſo truly? And to this queſtion you ſay juſt nothing: but conclude, becauſe this defence may be abuſed by ſome, it muſt be uſed by none. As if you ſhould have ſaid, S. *Peter* and S. *John* did ill to make ſuch an anſwer as they made, becauſe impious Hypocrites might make uſe of the ſame to palliate their diſobedience and rebellion againſt the lawful commands of lawful Authority.

81. Obj. *But ſeeing their pretended Reformation conſiſted in forſaking the Churches corruptions, their Reformation of themſelves, and their diviſion from you, falls out to be one and the ſame thing.*

Anſ. Juſt as if two men having been a long while companions in drunkenneſs, one of them ſhould turn ſober; this Reformation of himſelf, and diſertion of his companion, in this ill cuſtom, would be one and the ſame thing, and yet there is no neceſſity that he ſhould leave his love to him at all, or his ſociety in other things. So Proteſtants forſaking their own former corruptions, which were common to them with you, could not chooſe but withal forſake you in the practice of theſe corruptions: yet this they might, and would have done without breach of Charity towards you; and without a renunciation of your company in any act of piety and devotion, confeſſedly lawful. And therefore though both theſe were by accident joyned together, yet this hinders not but that the end they aimed at, was not a ſeparation from you, but a reformation of themſelves.

82. Neither *doth their diſagreement in the particulars of the Reformation*, (which yet when you meaſure it without partiality, you'll find to be far ſhort of infinite) *nor their ſymbolizing in the general of forſaking your corruptions*, prove

any thing to the contrary, or any way advantage your deſign or make for your purpoſe. For it is not any ſign at all, much leſs an evident ſign, that they had no ſetled deſign, but only to forſake the Church of *Rome:* for nothing but malice can deny, that their intent at leaſt was, to reduce Religion to that original purity from which it was fallen. The declination from which, ſome conceiving to have begun (though ſecretly) in the Apoſtles times, *(the myſtery of iniquity being then in work;)* and after their departure to have ſhewed it ſelf more openly: others again believing, that the Church continued pure for ſome Ages after the Apoſtles, and then declined: And conſequently ſome aiming at an exact conformity with the Apoſtolick times: Others thinking they ſhould do God and men good ſervice, could they reduce the Church to the condition of the fourth and fifth ages: Some taking their direction in this work of Reformation, only from Scripture; others from the Writings of Fathers, and the Decrees of Councils of the firſt five Ages: certainly it is no great marvel, that there was, as you ſay, diſagreement between them, in the particulars of their Reformation; nay morally ſpeaking, it was impoſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe. Yet let me tell you, the difference between them (eſpecially in compariſon of your Church and Religion,) is not the difference between good and bad, but between good and better: And they did beſt that followed Scripture, interpreted by Catholick written Tradition: which rule the Reformers of the Church of *England,* propoſed to themſelves to follow.

83. Ad 30. 31, 32.] D. *Potter,* p. 81. 82. of his Book, ſpeak thus. *If a Monaſtery ſhould reform it ſelf, and ſhould reduce into practice ancient good diſciplime, when others would not: In this caſe could it be charged with Schiſm from others, or with Apoſtacy from its rule and order? So in a ſociety of men univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, they that ſhould free themſelves from it, could they be therefore ſaid to ſeparate from the ſociety?* He preſumes they could not, and from hence concludes, *That neither can the Reformed Churches be truly accuſed for making a Schiſm, (that is ſeparating from*

from the Church, and making themſelves no members of it) if all they did was (as indeed it was) to reform themſelves.

84. Now inſtead of theſe two inſtances, which plainly ſhewed it poſſible in other ſocieties, and conſequently in that of the Church, to leave the faults of a Society, and not leave being of it, you diſingenuouſly foiſt in two other inſtances, clean croſs to the Doctors purpoſe, of men under colour of faults, abandoning the Society wherein they lived.

85. But that no ſuſpicion of tergiverſation may be faſtned upon me, I am content to deal with you a little, at your own weapons. Put the caſe then, though not juſt as you would have it, yet with as much favour to you, as in reaſon you can expect, That a Monaſtery did obſerve her ſubſtantial vows, and all principal ſtatutes, but yet did generally practiſe, and alſo enjoyn the violation of ſome leſſer, yet obliging obſervances, and had done ſo time out of mind. And that ſome inferiour Monks more conſcientious than the reſt, diſcovering this abuſe, ſhould firſt with all earneſtneſs ſollicite their Superiors for a general and orderly reformation of theſe, though ſmall and venial corruptions, yet corruptions: But finding they hoped and laboured in vain to effect this, ſhould reform theſe faults in themſelves, and refuſe to joyn in the practice of them, with the reſt of their Confraternity, and perſiſting reſolutely in ſuch a refuſal, ſhould by their Superiors be caſt out of their Monaſtery, and being not to be re-admitted without a promiſe of remitting from their ſtiffneſs in theſe things, and of condeſcending to others in the practice of their ſmall faults, ſhould chooſe rather to continue exiles, than to re-enter upon ſuch conditions: I would know whether you would condemn ſuch men of Apoſtacy from the Order? Without doubt if you ſhould, you would find the ſtream of your Caſuiſts againſt you, and beſides, involve S. *Paul* in the ſame condemnation, who plainly tells, that *we may not do the leaſt evil, that we may do the greateſt good.* Put caſe again, you ſhould be part of a Society univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, and diſcovering

vering a certain remedy for this diſeaſe, ſhould perſwade the whole company to make uſe of it, but find the greateſt part of them ſo far in love with their diſeaſe, that they were reſolved to keep it; and beſides, ſhould make a decree, that whoſoever would leave it, ſhould leave their company. Suppoſe now that your ſelf and ſome few others, ſhould notwithſtanding their injunction to the contrary, free your ſelves from this diſeaſe, and thereupon they ſhould abſolutely forſake and reject you: I would know in this caſe who deſerves to be condemned, whether you of uncharitable deſertion of your company, or they of a tyrannical peeviſhneſs? And if in theſe caſes you will (as I verily believe you will,) acquit the inferiors and condemn the ſuperiors, abſolve the minor part and condemn the major, then can you with no reaſon condemn Proteſtants, for chooſing rather to be ejected from the communion of the *Roman* Church, than with her to perſiſt (as of neceſſity they were to do, if they would continue in her Communion) in the profeſſion of Errors, though not deſtructive of ſalvation, yet hindering edification, and in the practice, or at leaſt approbati- of many, (ſuppoſe not mortal) but venial corruptions.

86. Beſides, you cenſure too partially the corrupt eſtate of your *Church in comparing it to a Monaſtery, which did confeſſedly obſerve their ſubſtantial Vows, and all principal Statutes of their order; and moreover was ſecured by an infallible aſſiſtance, for the avoiding of all ſubſtantial corruptions:* for of your Church we confeſs no ſuch matter, but ſay plainly, That ſhe not only might fall into ſubſtantial corruptions, but did ſo; that ſhe did not only generally violate, but of all the members of her Communion, either in act or approbation, require and exact the violation of many ſubſtantial Laws of Chriſt, both Ceremonial and Moral, which though we hope it was pardonable in them, who had not means to know their error, yet of its own nature, and to them who did or might have known their error, was certainly damnable. And that it was not the *Tything of Mint and Anniſe, and Cummin*, the neglect whereof

we

we impute unto you, but *the neglect of judgment, juſtice, and the weightier matters of the Law.*

87. Again, you compare Proteſtants to *ſuch a Company as acknowledge that themſelves, as ſoon as they were gone out of the Monaſtery that deferred to reform, muſt not hope to be free from thoſe or the like Errors and Corruptions for which they left their Brethren.* Which is very ſtrange, ſeeing this very hope and nothing elſe, moved them to leave your Communion: and this ſpeech of yours, ſo far as it concerns the ſame Errors, plainly deſtroys it ſelf. For how can they poſſibly fall into the ſame Errors by forſaking your Communion, which that they may forſake they do forſake your Communion? And then for other errors of the like nature and quality, or more enormous than yours, though they deny it not poſſible, but by their negligence and wickedneſs they may fall into them, yet they are ſo far from acknowledging that they have no hope to avoid this miſchief, that they proclaim to all the world, that it is moſt prone and eaſie to do ſo, to all thoſe that fear God and love the truth; and hardly poſſible for them to do otherwiſe, without ſupine negligence and extream impiety.

89. Obj. *But when* Luther *began, he being but one, oppoſed himſelf to all, as well Subjects as Superiors.*

Anſ. If he did ſo in the cauſe of God, it was heroically done of him. This had been without hyperbolizing, *Mundus contra Athanaſium*, and *Athanaſius contra Mundum*; *the world againſt* Athanaſius, *and* Athanaſius *againſt the world:* neither is it impoſſible, that *the whole world ſhould ſo far lie in wickedneſs* (as S. *John* ſpeaks) that it may be lawful and noble for one man to oppoſe the world. But yet were we put to our Oaths, we ſhould ſurely not teſtifie any ſuch thing for you; for how can we ſay properly and without ſtreining, that *he oppoſed himſelf to All*, unleſs we could ſay alſo, that All oppoſed themſelves to him? And how can we ſay ſo, ſeeing the world can witneſs, that ſo many thouſands, nay millions followed his ſtandard as ſoon as it was advanced.

90. But

90. But *none that lived immediatly before him thought or ſpake as he did.* This firſt is nothing to the purpoſe. The Church was then corrupted, and ſure it was no diſhonour to him to begin the Reformation. In the Chriſtian warfare, every man ought to ſtrive to be foremoſt. Secondly, it is more than you can juſtifie. For though no man before him lifted up his voice like a Trumpet, as *Luther* did, yet who can aſſure us, but that many before him, both thought and ſpake in lower voice of Petitions and Remonſtrances, in many points, as he did?

91. Obj. *Many chief learned Proteſtants, are forced to confeß the Antiquity of your Doctrin and practice.*

Anſ. Of many Doctrins and practices of yours this is not true; for I pray inform me, what confeſſions of Proteſtants have you, for the Antiquity of the Doctrin of the Communion in one kind: the lawfulneſs and expedience of the *Latin Service*: For the preſent uſe of Indulgences: For the Popes power in Temporalties over Princes: For the picturing of the Trinity: For the lawfulneſs of the worſhip of Pictures: For your Beads and Roſary, and Ladies Pſalter; and in a word, for your whole worſhip of the Bleſſed Virgin: For your oblations by way of conſumption, and therefore in the quality of Sacrifices to the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints: For your ſaying of *Pater noſters*, and Creeds to the honour of Saints, and of *Ave-Maries* to the honour of other Saints beſides the Bleſſed Virgin: For infallibility of the Biſhop or Church of *Rome*: For your prohibiting the Scripture to be read publickly in the Church, in ſuch Languages as all may underſtand: For your Doctrin of the Bleſſed Virgins immunity from actual ſin; and for your doctrin and worſhip of her Imaculate conception: For the neceſſity of Auricular Confeſſion: For the neceſſity of the Prieſts intention to obtain benefit by any of your Sacraments: And laſtly (not to trouble my ſelf with finding out more) for this very doctrin of Licentiouſneſs, That though a man live and die without the practice of Chriſtian vertues, and with the habits of many damnable ſins unmortified, yet if he in the laſt moment of life, have any ſorrow for his ſins, and joyn con-

confeſſion with it, certainly he ſhall be ſaved? Beſides, though ſome *Proteſtants* confeſs ſome of your Doctrine to be Ancient, yet this is nothing, ſo long as it is evident, even by the confeſſion of all ſides, that many Errors, I inſtance in that of the *Millenaries*, and the Communicating of Infants, were more Ancient. Not any antiquity thereof, unleſs it be abſolute and primitive, is a certain ſight of true Doctrine. For if the Church were obnoxious to corruption (as we pretend it was,) who can poſſible warrant us that part of this corruption, might not get in and prevail in the 5. or 4. or 3. or 2. Age? Eſpecially ſeeing the Apoſtles aſſure us that the *myſtery of iniquity was working*, though more ſecretly even in their times. If any man ask how could it become Univerſal in ſo ſhort a time? Let him tell me how the Error of the *Millenaries*, and the Communicating of Infants, became ſo ſoon Univerſal, and then he ſhall acknowledge, what was done in ſome, was poſſible in others. Laſtly, to cry quittance with you: As there are *Proteſtants* who confeſs the Antiquity, but always poſt-nate to Apoſtolick, of ſome points of your Doctrine: ſo there want not *Papiſts* who acknowledge as freely, the novelty of many of them, and the Antiquity of ours. A collection of whoſe Teſtimony, we have (without thanks to you) in your *Indices expurgatorii*: The Divine Providence, bleſſedly abuſing for the readier manifeſtation of the Truth this Engine intended by you for the ſubverſion and ſuppreſſion of it. Here is no place to ſtand upon particulars: only one general ingenuous confeſſion of that great *Eraſmus*, may not be paſſed over in ſilence. *Non deſunt magni Theologi, qui non verentur affirmare, nihil eſſe in* Luthero, *quin per probatos authores defendi poſſit. There want not great Divines, which ſtick not to affirm, that there is nothing in* Luther, *which may not be defended by good and allowed authors.* *Eraſm. Ep. lib. 15. Ep. ad Godeſchalcum. Roſ.*

92. After this you compoſe a heap of vain ſuppoſitions, pretended to be grounded on our confeſſions. As firſt, *that your Deſeaſes which we forſook, neither were nor could be mortal:* whereas we aſſure our ſelves, and are ready to juſtifie, that they are and were mortal in themſelves,

and would have been ſo to us, if when light came to us we had loved Darkneſs more than Light. Secondly, *that we had no hope to avoid other Diſeaſes like thoſe for which we forſook your company, nor to be ſecure out of it from damnable Errors:* whereas, in truth, the hope hereof was the only motive of our departure; and we aſſure our ſelves that the means to be ſecured from damnable Error, is not to be ſecure as you are, but carefully to uſe thoſe means of avoiding it, to which God hath promiſed, and will never fail to give a bleſſing. Thirdly, that *thoſe innumerable miſchiefs which followed upon the departure of* Proteſtants, *were cauſed by it as by a proper cauſe:* whereas their Doctrine was no otherwiſe the occaſion of them, than the Goſpel of Chriſt was of the diviſion of the World. The only Fountain of all theſe miſchiefs, being indeed no other than your pouring out a Flood of perſecutions againſt *Proteſtants*, only becauſe they would not ſin & be damned with you for company. Unleſs we may add the impatience of ſome *Proteſtants*, who not enduring to be Torn in peeces like Sheep by a company of Wolves without reſiſtance, choſe rather to die like Soldiers than Martyrs.

96. Obj. *But they endeavoured to force the Society whereof they were parts to be healed and reformed as they were; and if it refuſed, they did, when they had power drive them away, even their ſuperiours both Spiritual and Temporal as is notorious.* The proofs hereof are wanting and therefore I might defer my anſwer until they were produced; yet take this beforehand: If they did ſo, then herein, in my opinion, they did amiſs; for I have learnt from the Ancient Fathers of the Church, that *nothing is more againſt Religion than to force Religion*, and of S. *Paul, the Weapons of the Chriſtian Warfare are not carnal.* And great reaſon: For humane violence may make men counterfeit, but cannot make them believe; and is therefore fit for nothing but to breed form without, and *Atheiſm* within. Beſides, if this means of bringing men to embrace any Religion were generally uſed (as if it may be juſtly uſed in any place by thoſe that have power, and think they have truth, certainly they cannot with reaſon deny but that it may be uſed in every place,

place, by thoſe that have power as well as they, and think they have truth as well as they,) what could follow but the maintainance perhaps of truth, but perhaps only of the profeſſion of it in one place, and the oppreſſion of it in a hundred? What will follow from it but the preſervation peradventure of Unity, but peradventure only of uniformity in particular States and Churches; but the immortallizing the greater and more lamentable diviſions of Chriſtendom and the World? And therefore what can follow from it, but perhaps in the judgment of carnal policy, the temporal benefit and tranquillity of temporal States and kingdoms, but the infinit prejudice, if not the deſolation of the kingdom of Chriſt? And therefore it well becomes them who have their portions in this life, who ſerve no higher State than that of *England*, or *Spain*, or *France*, nor this neither any further than they may ſerve themſelves by it; who think of no other happineſs but the preſervation of their own fortunes and tranquillity in this World; who think of no other means to preſerve States, but humane power and Machiavillian policy; and believe no other Creed but this, *Regi aut Civitati imperium habenti nihil injuſtum, quod utile!* that to a King or City that has Ruling Power, nothing that is profitable is unjuſt. Such men as theſe it may become to maintain by worldly power and violence their State-inſtrument, Religion. For if all be vain and falſe, (as in their judgment it is) the preſent whatſoever, is better than any, becauſe it is already ſetled: and alteration of it may draw with it change of States, and the change of State the ſubverſion of their fortune. But they that are indeed Servants and lovers of Chriſt, of Truth, of the Church, and of Man-kind, ought with all courage to oppoſe themſelves againſt it, as a common Enemy of all theſe. They that know there is a King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, by whoſe will and pleaſure Kings and Kingdoms ſtand and fall, they know, that to no King or State any thing can be profitable which is unjuſt; and that nothing can be more evidently unjuſt, than to force weak men by the profeſſion of a Religion which they believe not,

to loſe their own Eternal Happineſs, out of a vain and needleſs fear, leſt they may poſſibly diſturb their temporal quietneſs. There is no danger to any ſtate from any mans opinion; unleſs it be ſuch an opinion by which diſobedience to authority, or impiety is taught or licenced, which ſort, I confeſs may juſtly be puniſhed as well as other faults; or unleſs this ſanguinary Doctrine be joyned with it, that it is lawful for him by humane violence to enforce others to it. Therefore if *Proteſtants* did offer violence to other Mens Conſciences and compel them to embrace their Reformation, I excuſe them not: much leſs if they did ſo to the ſacred Perſons of Kings, and thoſe that were in authority over them, who ought to be ſo ſecured from violence, that even their unjuſt and Tyrannous violence, though it may be avoided (according to that of our Saviour, *When they perſecute you in one Citty fly into another*,) yet may it not be reſiſted by oppoſing violence againſt it. *Proteſtants* therefore that were guilty of this crime, are not to be excuſed, and bleſſed had they been, had they choſen rather to be Martyrs than Murtherers, and to die for their Religion rather than to fight for it. But of all the men in the World you are the moſt unfit to accuſe them hereof, againſt whom the Souls of Martyrs from under the Altar cry much louder than againſt all their other Perſecutors together: Who for theſe many Ages together have daily ſacrificed *Hecatombs* of Innocent Chriſtians, under the name of Hereticks, to your blind zeal and furious ſuperſtition. Who teach plainly, that you may propagate your Religion whenſoever you have power by depoſing of Kings and Invaſion of Kingdoms, and think when you kill the Adverſaries of it, you do God good ſervice. But for their departing corporally from them, whom mentally they had forſaken: For their forſaking the external Communion and company of that part of the unreformed part of the Church, in their ſuperſtitions and impieties: thus much of your accuſation we embrace and glory in it; And ſay though ſome Proteſtants might offend in the manner or the degree of their ſeparation, yet certainly their ſeparation it ſelf was not Schiſmatical, but Innocent, and not only ſo, but juſt and neceſſary.

99. Ad

99. Ad §. 36.] What you cite out of *Optatus* (*l. 2. cont. Parm. Thou canſt not deny but that thou knoweſt, that in the City of* Rome *there was firſt an Epiſcopal Chair placed for* Peter, *wherein* Peter *the head of the Apoſtles ſate, whereof alſo he was called* Cephas; *in which one Chair Unity was to be kept by all, leſt the other Apoſtles might attribute to themſelves each one his particular Chair; and that he ſhould be a Schiſmatick and ſinner, who againſt that one ſingle Chair ſhould erect another.* All this is impertinent, if it be well lookt into. The truth is the *Donatiſts* had ſet up at *Rome* a Biſhop of their faction: not with intent to make him Biſhop of the whole Church but of that Church in particular. Now *Optatus* going upon S. *Cyprians* ground *of one Biſhop in one Church*, proves them Schiſmatick for ſo doing, by this Argument: S. *Peter* was firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, neither did the Apoſtles attribute to themſelves each one his particular Chair, (viz. *in that City*, for in other places others I hope had Chairs beſides S. *Peter*) and therefore he is a Schiſmatick, who againſt that one ſingle Chair erects another (viz. *in that place*) making another Biſhop of that Dioceſs beſides him who was lawfully elected to it.

100. *Obj.* But *he ſtiles S.* Peter *Head of the Apoſtles, and ſays that from thence he was called* Cephas.

Anſw. Perhaps he was abuſed into this opinion, by thinking *Cephas* derived from the Greek word Κεφαλὴ a head: whereas it is a *Syriack* word and ſignifies a Stone. Beſides S. *Peter* might be head of the Apoſtles, that is firſt in order and honour among them, and not have ſupream Authority over them. And indeed that S. *Peter* ſhould have authority over all the Apoſtles, and yet exerciſe no one Act of Authority over any one of them, and that they ſhould ſhew to him no ſign of ſubjection, methinks is as ſtrange, as that a King of *England* for twenty five years ſhould do no Act of Regality, nor receive any one acknowledgment of it. As ſtrange methinks it is, that you ſo many Ages after, ſhould know this ſo certainly, as you pretend to do, and that the Apoſtles (after that thoſe words were ſpoken in their hearing, by vertue whereof S. *Peter* is pretended to have

have been made their Head,) ſhould ſtill be ſo ignorant of it, as to queſtion *which of them ſhould be the greateſt*? yet more ſtrange, that our Saviour ſhould not bring them out of their Error, by telling them S. *Peter* was the man, but rather confirm it by ſaying, *the Kings of the Gentiles exerciſe authority over them, but it ſhould not be ſo among them.* No leſs a wonder was it that S. *Paul* ſhould ſo far forget S. *Peter* and himſelf, as that firſt mentioning him often, he ſhould do it without any Title of Honour. Secondly, ſpeaking of the ſeveral degrees of men in the Church, he ſhould not give S. *Peter* the higheſt, but place him in equipage with the reſt of the Apoſtles, and ſay, *God hath appointed* (not *firſt* Peter, *then the reſt* of the Apoſtles, but) *firſt Apoſtles, ſecondly Prophets.* Certainly if the Apoſtles were *all firſt*, to me it is very probable, that no one of them was before the reſt. For by *Firſt*, all men underſtand either that which is before all, or that before which is nothing. Now in the former ſenſe, the Apoſtles could not be all firſt, for then every one of them muſt have been before every one of the reſt. And therefore they muſt be *Firſt* in the other ſenſe. And therefore, No man, and therefore not S. *Peter*, muſt be before any of them. Thirdly and Laſtly, that ſpeaking of himſelf in particular, and perhaps comparing himſelf with S. *Peter* in particular, rather than any other, he ſhould ſay in plain terms, *I am in nothing inferior to the very Chiefeſt Apoſtles.* But beſides all this, though we ſhould grant againſt all theſe probabilities and many more, that *Optatus* meant that S. *Peter* was head of the Apoſtles, not in our but in your ſenſe, and that S. *Peter* indeed was ſo; yet ſtill you are very far from ſhewing, that in the judgment of *Optatus*, the Biſhop of *Rome* was to be at all, much leſs by Divine right, ſucceſſor to S. *Peter* in this his Headſhip and Authority. For what incongruity is there, if we ſay, that he might ſucceed S. *Peter* in that part of his care, the Government of that particular Church, (as ſure he did even while S. *Peter* was living,) and yet that neither he nor any man was to ſucceed him in his Apoſtleſhip, nor in his Government

of

of the Church Univerſal? Eſpecially ſeeing S. *Peter* and the reſt of the Apoſtles, by laying the Foundations of the Church, were to be the *Foundations of it*, and accordingly are ſo called in Scripture. And therefore as in a building it is incongruous that Foundations ſhould ſucceed Foundations: So it may be in the Church, that any other Apoſtle ſhould ſucceed the firſt.

101. Ad §. 37.] *Obj.* What you here cite out of S. *Auſtin*; if it be applied to *Luther*'s Separation, is impertinent. For it is one thing to ſeparate from the Communion of the whole World, another to ſeparate from all the Communions in the World: One thing to divide from them who are United among themſelves, another to divide from them who are divided among themſelves. Now the *Donatiſts* ſeparated from the whole World of Chriſtians, United in one Communion, profeſſing the ſame Faith, ſerving God after the ſame manner, which was a very great Argument, that they could not have juſt cauſe to leave them: according to that of *Tertullian*, *Variaſſe debuerat error Eccleſiarum, quod autem apud multos unum eſt, non eſt Erratum ſed Traditum.* But *Luther* and his followers did not ſo. The World, I mean of Chriſtians and Catholicks, was divided and ſubdivid ed long before he divided from it; and by their diviſions had much weakened their own Authority, and taken away from you this Plea of S. *Auſtin*, which ſtands upon no other Foundation, but the Unity of the whole Worlds Communion.

102. Ad §. 38.] Obj. *If* Luther *were in the right, moſt certain thoſe* Proteſtants *that differed from him were in the wrong.*

Anſw. But that either he or they were Schiſmaticks, it follows not. Or if it does, then either the Jeſuits are Schiſmaticks from the *Dominicans*, or they from the Jeſuites; The *Canoniſts* from the Jeſuits, or the Jeſuits from the *Canoniſts*: The *Scotiſts* from the *Thomiſts*, or they from the *Scotiſts*: The *Franciſcans* from the *Dominicans*, or the *Dominicans* from the *Franciſcans*. For between all theſe the World knows, that in point of Doctrine, there is plain and irreconcileable contradiction, and therefore one Part muſt be in Error, at leaſt not Fundamental. Thus your Argument

gument returns upon your ſelf, and if it be good, proves the *Roman* Church in a manner to be made up of Schiſmaticks. But the anſwer to it is, that it begs this very falſe and vain ſuppoſition; That whoſoever Errs in any point of Doctrine is a Schiſmatick.

103. Ad §. 39.] In the next place you number up your Victories, and tell us, *that out of theſe premiſes, this concluſion follows, That* Luther *and his followers were Schiſmaticks from the Viſible Church, the* Pope, *the Dioceſs wherein they were baptized, from the Biſhop under whom they lived, from the Country to which they belonged, from their Religious order, wherein they were profeſſed, from one another, and laſtly, from a mans ſelf: Becauſe the ſelf ſame* Proteſtant *is convicted to day, that his yeſterdays opinion was an Error.* To which I anſwer, that *Luther* and his followers ſeparated from many of theſe, in ſome opinions and practices: But that they did it without cauſe, which only can make them Schiſmaticks, that was the only thing you ſhould have proved, and to that you have not urged one reaſon of any moment. All of them for weight and ſtrength, were couſin-germans to this pretty device, wherewith you will prove them Schiſmaticks from themſelves, *becauſe the ſelf ſame* Proteſtant *to day is convicted in Conſcience, that his yeſterdays opinion was an Error.* It ſeems then that they that hold Errors, muſt hold them faſt, and take eſpecial care of being convicted in Conſcience, that they are in Error, for fear of being Schiſmaticks! *Proteſtants* muſt continue *Proteſtants*, and *Puritans Puritans*, and *Papiſts Papiſts*, nay *Jews*, and *Turks*, and *Pagans*, muſt remain *Jews*, and *Turks*; and *Pagans*, and go on conſtantly to the Devil, or elſe forſooth they muſt be *Schiſmaticks*, and that *from themſelves*. And this perhaps is the cauſe that makes *Papiſts* ſo obſtinate, not only in their common ſuperſtition, but alſo in adhering to the proper fancies of their ſeveral Sects, ſo that it is a miracle to hear of any Jeſuit, that hath forſaken the opinion of the Jeſuits: or any *Dominican* that hath changed his or the Jeſuits.

But ſure the forſaking of error cannot be a ſin, unleſs to be in error be a vertue. And therefore, to do as you do,

do, to damn men for falſe opinions, and to call them Schiſmaticks for leaving them; to make pertinacy in error, that is, an unwillingneſs to be convicted, or a reſolution not to be convicted, the form of Hereſies, and to find fault with men, for being convicted in conſcience that they are in error, is the moſt incoherent and contradictious injuſtice that ever was heard of. But Sir, if this be a ſtrange matter to you, that which I ſhall tell you will be much ſtranger. I know a man that of a moderate Proteſtant turned a Papiſt, and the day that he did ſo, (as all things that are done are perfected ſome day or other,) was convicted in conſcience, that his yeſterdays opinion was an error, and yet thinks he was no Schiſmatick for doing ſo, and deſires to be informed by you, whether or no he was miſtaken? The ſame man afterwards upon better conſideration, became a doubting Papiſt, and of a doubting Papiſt, a confirmed Proteſtant. And yet this man thinks himſelf no more to blame for all theſe changes, than a Traveller, who uſing all diligence to find the right way to ſome remote City, where he never had been, (as the party I ſpeak of had never been in Heaven,) did yet miſtake it, and after find his error, and amend it. Nay he ſtands upon his juſtification ſo far, as to maintain that his alterations, not only to you, but alſo from you by Gods mercy, were the moſt ſatisfactory actions to himſelf, that ever he did, and the greateſt victories that ever he obtained over himſelf, and his affections to thoſe things which in this world are moſt precious; as wherein for Gods ſake and (as he was verily perſwaded,) out of love to the Truth, he went upon a certain expectation of thoſe inconveniences, which to ingenuous natures are of all moſt terrible. So that though there were much weakneſs in ſome of theſe alterations, yet certainly there was no wickedneſs. Neither does he yield his weakneſs altogether without apology, ſeeing his deductions were rational, and out of Principles commonly received by Proteſtants as well as Papiſts, and which by his education had got poſſeſſion of his underſtanding.

107. Ad §. 41.] Obj. *Though the firſt Reformers had conceived their own opinions to be true, yet they might and ought to have doubted, whether they were certain; ſince they affirm, that Infallibility was not promiſed to particular perſons or Churches.*

Anſ. This is to ſay, that they ought to have doubted of the certainty of Scripture, which in formal and expreſs terms, contains many of theſe opinions. And your reaſon is vain; for *though they had not an abſolute infallibility promiſed unto them,* yet may they be of ſome things infallibly certain. As *Euclide* ſure was not infallible, yet he was certain enough, that *twice two were four,* and *that every whole was greater than a part of that whole.* And ſo though *Calvin* and *Melancton* were not infallible in all things, yet they might and did know well enough, that your *Latin-Service* was condemned by S. *Paul,* and that the Communion in both kinds was taught by our Saviour.

Obj. But *your Church was in peaceable poſſeſſion* (you muſt mean of her Doctrin and the Profeſſors of it) *and enjoyed preſcription for many Ages.*

Anſ. The poſſeſſion which the Governors of your Church held for ſome ages, of the party governed, was not peaceable, but got by fraud and held by violence.

108. Obj. You ſay that *a pretence of Conſcience will not ſerve to juſtifie ſeparation from being Schiſmatical.*

Anſ. This is very true but little to the purpoſe, ſeeing it is not an erroneous perſwaſion, much leſs an hypocritical pretence, but a true and well grounded conviction of Conſcience, which we alledge to juſtifie Proteſtants from being Schiſmatical. And therefore though Seditious men in Church and State, may pretend conſcience for a cloak of their rebellion: yet this I hope hinders not, but that an honeſt man ought to obey his rightly informed conſcience, rather than the unjuſt commands of his Tyrannous Superiors. Otherwiſe with what colour can you defend either your own refuſing the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy? Or the ancient Martyrs, and Apoſtles, and Prophets, who oftentimes diſobeyed the commands of men in authority, and for their diſobedience made

made no other but this Apology, *We muſt obey God rather than men?* It is therefore moſt apparent that this anſwer muſt be meerly impertinent: ſeeing it will ſerve againſt the Martyrs and Apoſtles and Prophets, and even againſt your ſelves, as well as againſt Proteſtants. To as little purpoſe is your rule out of *Lyrinenſis* againſt them that followed *Luther*, ſeeing they pretend and are ready to juſtifie, that they forſook not, with the Doctors, the faith, but only the corruption of the Church. As vain altogether is that which follows: That *in caſes of uncertainty we are not to leave our Superior, or caſt off his obedience, nor publickly oppoſe his decrees.* From whence it will follow very evidently, that ſeeing it is not a matter of faith, but a diſputed queſtion among you, whether the Oath of Allegiance be lawful: that either you acknowledge not the King your Superior, or do againſt conſcience, in oppoſing his and the kingdoms decree, requiring the taking of this Oath. This good uſe, I ſay, may very fairly be made of it, and is by men of your own Religion.

109 Ad §. 42.] Obj. *It is not fit*, you ſay, *for any private man to oppoſe his judgment to the publick.*

Anſ. Not his own judgment and bare authority; but occaſions may happen, wherein it may be very warrantable, to oppoſe his reaſon or the authority of Scripture againſt it: and is not then to be eſteemed to oppoſe his own judgment to the publick, but the judgment of God to the judgment of men.

Neither will Mr. *Hookers* words you cite do you any ſervice. For though he ſays (*Pref.* to *Eccleſ. polit.* ſee 6. *pag.* 28.) *that men are bound to do whatſoever the ſentence of judicial and final deciſion ſhall determine*; as it is plain men are bound to yield ſuch an obedience to all Courts of civil judicature: yet he ſays not, they *are bound to think* that determination lawful and that ſentence juſt. Nay it is plain he ſays, that *they muſt do according to the Judges ſentence, though in their private opinion it ſeem unjuſt.* As if I be wrongfully caſt in a ſuit at Law, and ſentenced to pay an hundred pound, I am bound to pay the money, yet I know no Law of God or man, that binds me in conſcience

to acquit the Judge of error in his sentence. Neither is there any *necessity*, as you say, *that he must either* acknowledge the *Universal Infallibility of the Church, or drive men into dissembling against their Conscience*; seeing nothing hinders, but I may obey the sentence of a Judge, paying the mony he awards me to pay, or forgoing the house or land which he hath judged from me, and yet withal plainly profess, that in my Conscience I conceive his Judgment erroneous. To which purpose they have a saying in *France*, that *whosoever is cast in any cause, hath liberty for ten days after, to rail at his Judges.*

110. But observe, I pray, that Mr. *Hooker* says not absolutely and in all their causes; but onely *in litigious causes, of the quality of those whereof he* there treats; In such matters as have plain Scripture or reason neither for them nor against them, and wherein men are perswaded this or that way, *upon their own only probable collection*; in such cases, *This perswasion* (saith he) *ought to be fully setled in mens hearts, that the will of God is, that they should not disobey the certain commands of their lawful Superiors, upon uncertain grounds: But do that which the sentence of judicial and final decision shall determin.* For the purpose, a Question there is, whether a Surplice may be worn in Divine Service: The authority of Superiors injoyns this Ceremony, and neither Scripture nor reason plainly forbids it. *Sempronius* notwithstanding, is by some inducements, which he confesses to be onely probable, lead to this perswasion that the thing is unlawful. The *quære* is, whether he ought for matter of practice follow the injunction of authority, or his own private and only probable perswasion? M. *Hooker* resolves for the former, upon this ground, that the *certain commands of the Church we live in, are to be obeyed in all things, not certainly unlawful.*

As for requiring a blind and an unlimited obedience, to Ecclesiastical decisions universally and in all cases, even when plain Text or reason seems to controul them, M. *Hooker* is as far from making such an Idol of Ecclesiastical Authority, as the Puritans whom he writes against. *I grant* (saith he,) *that proof derived from the authority of*

mans

mans judgment, is not able to work that aſſurance which doth grow by a ſtronger proof. And therefore although ten thouſand General Councils would ſet down one and the ſame definitive ſentence, concerning any point of Religion whatſoever, yet one demonſtrative reaſon alledged, or one manifeſt teſtimony cited from the word of God himſelf, to the contrary, could not chooſe but over-weigh them all: in as much as for them to be deceived it is not impoſſible, it is that Demonſtrative Reaſon, or Divine Teſtimony ſhould deceive. And again, *Whereas it is thought, that eſpecially with the Church, and thoſe that are called, mans authority ought not to prevail: It muſt and doth prevail even with them, yea with them eſpecially, as far as equity requireth, and farther we maintain it not. For men to be tied and led by authority, as it were with a kind of captivity of judgment, and though there be reaſon to the contrary, not to liſten to it, but to follow like beaſts, the firſt in the Herd, this were brutiſh.* Again, *that authority of men ſhould prevail with men either againſt or above reaſon, is no part of our belief. Companies of learned men, be they never ſo great and reverend, are to yield unto reaſon, the weight whereof, is no whit prejudiced by the ſimplicity of his perſon which doth alledge it, but being found to be ſound and good, the bare opinion of men to the contrary, muſt of neceſſity ſtoop and give place.* Thus M. *Hooker* in his Seventh Section of his Second Book.

112. Ad §. 43.] The next Section hath in it ſome objections againſt *Luthers* perſon, but none againſt his cauſe, which alone I have undertaken to juſtifie, and therefore I paſs it over. Yet this I promiſe, that when you, or any of your ſide, ſhall publiſh a good defence, of all that your Popes have ſaid and done, eſpecially of them whom *Bellarmine* believes, in ſuch a long train *to have gone to the Devil:* then you ſhall receive an ample Apology for all the actions and words of *Luther.* In the mean time, I hope all reaſonable and equitable Judges, will eſteem it not unpardonable in the great and Heroical ſpirit of *Luther,* if being oppoſed, and perpetually baited with a world of Furies, he were tranſported ſometimes, and made ſomewhat furious. As for you, I deſire you to be quiet, and to demand no more, whether God be wont to ſend ſuch Furies.

ries to preach the Goſpel? Unleſs you deſire to hear of your killing of Kings: Maſſacring of Peoples; Blowing up of Parliaments: and have a mind to be ask't, whether it be probable, that that ſhould be Gods cauſe, which needs to be maintained by ſuch Deviliſh means?

CHAP. VI.

The ANSWER to the Sixth CHAPTER.

Shewing that Proteſtants are not Hereticks.

Ad §. 1. HE that will accuſe any one man, much more any great multitude of men of any great and horrible crime, ſhould in all reaſon and juſtice take care that the greatneſs of his evidence do equal, if not exceed the quality of the crime. And ſuch an accuſation you would here make ſhew of, by pretending, firſt, *to lay ſuch grounds of it, as are either already proved, or elſe yielded on all ſides:* and after to raiſe a firm and ſtable ſtructure of convincing arguments upon them. But both theſe I find to be meer and vain pretences, and having conſidered this Chapter alſo without prejudice or paſſion, as I did the former, I am enforced by the light of Truth, to pronounce your whole diſcourſe, a painted and ruinous Building upon a weak and ſandy foundation.

2. Ad §. 2, 3. Firſt for your grounds, a great part of them, is falſely ſaid to be either proved or granted. It is true indeed that *Man by his natural wit and induſtry could never have attained to the knowledge of Gods will to give him a ſupernatural and eternal happineſs*, nor of the means by which his pleaſure was to beſtow this happineſs upon him. And therefore your firſt ground is good, *That it was requiſite his underſtanding ſhould be enabled to apprehend that end and means by a knowledge ſupernatural.* I ſay this is good, if you mean by *knowledge*, an apprehenſion or belief.

3. But

3. But then whereas you add, *that if a ſuch a knowledge were no more than probable, it could not be able ſufficiently to overbear our will, and encounter with human probabilities, being backed with the ſtrength of fleſh and blood, and therefore conclude, that it was farther neceſſary, that this ſupernatural knowledge ſhould be moſt certain and infallible:* To this I anſwer, that I do heartily acknowledge and believe the Articles of our Faith be in themſelves Truths, as certain and infallible as the very common Principles of Geometry and Metaphyſicks. But that there is required of us a knowledge of them, and an adherence to them, as certain as that of ſenſe or ſcience, that ſuch a certainty is required of us under pain of damnation, ſo that no man can hope to be in the ſtate of ſalvation, but he that finds in himſelf ſuch a degree of faith, ſuch a ſtrength of adherence: This I have already demonſtrated to be a great error, and of dangerous and pernitious conſequence. And becauſe I am more and more confirmed in my perſwaſion that the Truth which I there delivered, is of great and ſingular uſe, I will here confirm it with more reaſons. And to ſatisfie you that this is no ſingularity of my own my Margent preſents you with a * Proteſtant Divine of great authority, and no way ſingular in his opinions, who hath long ſince preached and juſtified the ſame doctrin.

* M. *Hooker* in his anſwer to *Travers* his ſupplication. —

I have taught that the aſſurance of things which we believe by the word, is not ſo certain as of that we perceive by ſence. And is it as certain? Yea I taught, that the things which God doth promiſe in his word are ſurer unto us than any thing we touch, handle or ſee. But are we ſo ſure and certain of them? If we be, why doth God ſo often prove his promiſes unto us, as he doth by arguments taken from our ſenſible experience? We muſt be ſurer of the proof than the thing proved, otherwiſe it is no proof. How is it that if ten men do all look upon the Moon, every one of them knows it as certainly to be the Moon as another: but many believing one and the ſame promiſes all have not one and the ſame fulneſs of perſwaſion? How falleth it out that men being aſſured of any thing by ſence, can be no ſurer of it than they are? whereas the ſtrongeſt in faith that liveth upon the earth, had always need to labour, and ſtrive, and pray, that his aſſurance concerning heavenly and ſpiritual things may grow, increaſe, and be augmented.

4. I ſay that every Text of Scripture which makes mention of any that were *weak*, or of any that were *ſtrong in faith*: of any that were *of little*, or any that were *of great faith*:

of

of any that *abounded*, or any that were *rich* in faith: of *encreaſing*, *growing*, *rooting*, *grounding*, *eſtabliſhing*, *confirming in faith*: Every ſuch Text, is a demonſtrative refutation of this vain fancy: proving that faith, even true and ſaving faith, is not a thing conſiſting in ſuch an indiviſible point of perfection as you make it, but capable of augmentation and diminution. Every Prayer you make to God to encreaſe your faith (or if you conceive ſuch a prayer derogatory from the perfection of your faith, (*The Apoſtles praying to Chriſt to encreaſe their Faith*, is a convincing argument of the ſame concluſion. Moreover if this doctrin of yours were true, then ſeeing not any the leaſt doubting can conſiſt with a moſt infallible certainty, it will follow that every leaſt doubting in any matter of faith, though reſiſted and involuntary, is a damnable ſin, abſolutely deſtructive, ſo long as it laſts, of all true and ſaving faith: which you are ſo far from granting, that you make it no ſin at all, but only an occaſion of merit: and if you ſhould eſteem it a ſin, then muſt you acknowledge, contrary to your own Principles, that there are Actual ſins meerly involuntary. The ſame is furthermore invincibly confirmed by every deliberate ſin that any Chriſtian commits; by any progreſs in Charity that he makes. For ſeeing, as S. *John* aſſures us, *our faith is the victory which overcomes the world*, certainly if the faith of all true Believers were perfect, (and if true faith be capable of no imperfection, if all faith be a knowledge moſt certain and infallible, all faith muſt be perfect, for the moſt imperfect that is, according to your doctrin, if it be true, muſt be *moſt certain*, and ſure the moſt perfect that is, cannot be more than moſt certain,) then certainly their victory over the World, and therefore over the fleſh, and therefore over ſin, muſt of neceſſity be perfect, and ſo it ſhould be impoſſible for any true believer to commit any deliberate ſin, and therefore he that commits any ſin, muſt not think himſelf a true believer. Beſides ſeeing Faith worketh by Charity, and Charity is the effect of Faith: certainly if the cauſe were perfect, the effect would be perfect, and conſequently as you make no degrees in Faith, ſo there would be none in Charity, and ſo no

man

man could poſſibly make any progreſs in it, but all true believers ſhould be equally in Charity, as in Faith you make them equal: and from thence it would follow unavoidably, that whoſoever finds in himſelf any true Faith, muſt preſently perſuade himſelf that he is perfect in Charity: and whoſoever on the other ſide, diſcovers in his Charity any imperfection, muſt not believe that he hath any true Faith. Theſe you ſee are ſtrange and portentous conſequences, and yet the deduction of them from your Doctrine is clear and apparent; which ſhews this Doctrine of yours, which you would fain have true, that there might be ſome neceſſity of your Churches Infallibility, to be indeed plainly repugnant not only to Truth but even to all Religion and Piety, and fit for nothing but to make men negligent of making any Progreſs in Faith or Charity.

5. As for that one ſingle reaſon which you produce to confirm it, it will appear upon examination to be reſolved finally into a groundleſs Aſſertion of your own, contrary to all Truth and experience, and that is, *That no degree of Faith, leſs than a moſt certain and infallible knowledge, can be able ſufficiently to overbear our will and encounter with humane probabilities, being backt with the ſtrength of Fleſh and Blood.* For who ſees not that many Millions in the World forgoe many times their preſent eaſe and pleaſure, undergo great and toilſom labours, encounter great difficulties, adventure upon great dangers, and all this not upon any certain expectation, but upon a probable hope of ſome future gain and commodity, and that not infinite and Eternal, but finite and temporal? Who ſees not that many men abſtain from many things they exceedingly deſire, not upon any certain aſſurance, but a probable fear of danger that may come after? What man ever was there ſo madly in love with a preſent penny, but that he would willingly ſpend it upon any little hope, that by doing ſo he might gain an hundred thouſand pound? And I would fain know *what gay probabilities* you could deviſe to diſſuade him from this Reſolution. And if you can deviſe none, what reaſon then, or ſenſe is there, but that

a probable hope of infinite and Eternal Happineſs, provided for all thoſe that obey *Chriſt Jeſus*, and much more a firm Faith, though not ſo certain, in ſome ſort, as ſenſe or ſcience, may be able to ſway our will to obedience, and encounter with all thoſe temptations which Fleſh and Blood can ſuggeſt to avert us from it? Men may therefore talk their pleaſure of an abſolute and moſt infallible certainty, but did they generally believe that obedience to Chriſt were the only way to preſent and eternal felicity, but as firmly and undoubtedly as that there is ſuch a City as *Conſtantinople*, nay but as much as *Cæſars* Commentaries, or the Hiſtory of *Saluſt*, I believe the lives of moſt men, both *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants* would be better than they are. Thus therefore out of your own Words I argue againſt you: He that requires to true Faith, an abſolute and infallible certainty, for this only Reaſon, *becauſe any leſs degree could not be able to overbear our will*, &c. imports, that if a leſs degree of Faith were able to do this, then a leſs degree of Faith may be true and Divine and ſaving Faith: But experience ſhews, and reaſon confirms, that a firm Faith, though not ſo certain as ſenſe or ſcience, may be able to encounter and overcome our will and affections: And therefore it follows from your own reaſon, that Faith which is not a moſt certain and infallible knowledge may be true and Divine and ſaving Faith.

6. All theſe Reaſons I have imployed to ſhew that ſuch a moſt certain and infallible Faith as here you talk of, is not ſo neceſſary, but that without ſuch a high degree of it, it is poſſible to pleaſe God. And therefore the Doctrines delivered by you §. 25. are moſt preſumptuous and uncharitable: *viz. That ſuch a moſt certain and Infallible Faith is neceſſary to Salvation, neceſſitate Finis, or Medii*, ſo neceſſary, that *after a man is come to the uſe of reaſon, no man ever was or can be ſaved without it.* Wherein you boldly intrude into the judgment ſeat of God, and damn men for breaking Laws, not of Gods, but your own making. But withal, you clearly contradict your ſelf, not only where you affirm, *That your Faith depends finally upon the Tradition of Age to Age, of Father to Son*, which cannot be a fit ground, but

but only for a Moral Aſſurance; nor only, where you pretend, that *not alone Hearing and Seeing*, but alſo *Hiſtories, Letters, Relations of many* (which certainly are things not certain and infallible,) *are yet Foundations good enough to ſupport your Faith*; Which Doctrine, if it were good and allowable, *Proteſtants* might then hope that their Hiſtories and Letters and Relations might alſo paſs for means ſufficient of a ſufficient Certainty, and that they ſhould not be excluded from Salvation for want of ſuch a Certainty. But indeed the preſſure of the preſent difficulty compelled you to ſpeak here, what I believe you will not juſtifie, and with a pretty tergiverſation to ſhew D. *Potter* your means of moral certainty; whereas the Objection was that you had no means or poſſibility of infallible certainty, for which you are plainly at as great a loſs and as far to ſeek as any of your Adverſaries. And therefore it concerns you highly not to damn others for want of it, leſt you involve your ſelves in the ſame condemnation; according to thoſe terrible Words of S. *Paul*, *Inexcuſabilis es*, &c. In this therefore you plainly contradict your ſelf. And laſtly moſt plainly, in ſaying as you do here, you contradict and retract your pretence of Charity to *Proteſtants* in the beginning of your Book: For there you make profeſſion, that *you have no aſſurance but that* Proteſtants *dying* Proteſtants, *may poſſibly die with contrition, and be ſaved:* And here you are very Peremptory, that *they cannot but want a means abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, and wanting that cannot but be damned.*

7. The third Condition you require to Faith, is, that our aſſent to Divine Truths ſhould *not only be unknown and unevident by any humane diſcourſe*, but that *abſolutely alſo it ſhould be obſcure in it ſelf, and ordinarily ſpeaking, be void even of ſupernatural evidence.* Which words muſt have a very favourable conſtruction, or elſe they will not be ſenſe. For who can make any thing of theſe words taken properly, that *Faith muſt be an unknown unevident aſſent, or an aſſent abſolutely obſcure?* I had always thought that known and unknown, obſcure and evident had been affections, not of our Aſſent, but the Object of it, not of

our belief, but the thing believed. For well may we aſſent to a thing unknown, obſcure, or unevident; but that our aſſent it ſelf ſhould be called therefore unknown or obſcure, ſeems to me as great an impropriety, as if I ſhould ſay, your ſight were green or blew, becauſe you ſee ſomething that is ſo. In other places therefore I anſwer your words, but here I muſt anſwer your meaning: which I conceive to be, That it is neceſſary to Faith that the Objects of it, the points which we believe ſhould not be ſo evidently certain, as to neceſſitate our underſtandings to an Aſſent, that ſo their might be ſome merit in Faith, as you love to ſpeak (who will not receive no not from God himſelf, but a penny-worth for a penny,) but as we, ſome obedience in it, which can hardly have place where there is no poſſibility of diſobedience, as there is not where the underſtanding does all, and the will nothing. Now ſeeing the Religion of *Proteſtants*, though it be much more credible than yours, yet is not pretended to have the abſolute evidence of ſenſe or demonſtration; therefore I might let this Doctrine paſs without exception, for any prejudice that can redound to us by it. But yet I muſt not forbear to tell you, that your diſcourſe proves indeed this condition requiſite to the merit, but yet not to the eſſence of Faith: without it Faith were not an act of obedience, but yet Faith may be Faith without it; and this you muſt confeſs, unleſs you will ſay either the Apoſtles believed not the whole Goſpel which they preached, or that they were not eye-witneſſes of a great part of it: unleſs you will queſtion S. *John* for ſaying *that which we have ſeen with our Eyes, and which our hands have handled*, &c. *declare we unto you:* nay our Saviour himſelf for ſaying, Thomas *becauſe thou ſeeſt thou believeſt, Bleſſed are they which have not ſeen and yet have believed.* Yet if you will ſay that in reſpect of the things which they ſaw, the Apoſtles aſſent was not pure and proper and meer Faith, but ſomewhat more; an aſſent containing Faith but ſuperadding to it, I will not contend with you, for it will be a contention about words. But then again I muſt crave leave to tell you,

that

that the requiring this condition, is in my judgment a plain revocation of the former. For had you made the matter of Faith either naturally or ſupernaturally evident, it might have been a fitly attempered and duly proportioned object for an abſolute certainty natural or ſupernatural: But requiring as you do, *that Faith ſhould be an abſolute knowledge of a thing not abſolutely known, an infallible certainty of a thing which though it is in it ſelf, yet is it not made appear to us to be infallibly certain,* to my underſtanding you ſpeak impoſſibilities. And truly for one of your Religion to do ſo, is but a good *Decorum.* For the matter and object of your Faith being ſo full of contradictions, a contradictious Faith may very well become a contradictious Religion. Your Faith therefore, if you pleaſe to have it ſo, let it be a free, neceſſitated, certain, uncertain, evident, obſcure, prudent and fooliſh, natural and ſupernatural unnatural aſſent. But they which are unwilling to believe nonſenſe themſelves, or to perſuade others to do ſo, it is but reaſon they ſhould make the Faith wherewith they believe, an intelligible, compoſſible, conſiſtent thing, and not define it by repugnances. Now nothing is more repugnant, than that a man ſhould be required to give moſt certain credit unto that which cannot be made apppear moſt certainly credible: and if it appear to him to be ſo, then is it not obſcure that it is ſo. For if you ſpeak of an acquired, rational, diſcurſive Faith, certainly theſe Reaſons which make the object ſeem credible, muſt be the cauſe of it, and conſequently the ſtrength and firmity of my aſſent muſt riſe and fall together with the apparent credibility of the object. If you ſpeak of a ſupernatural infuſed Faith, then you either ſuppoſe it infuſed by the former means, and then that which was ſaid before muſt be ſaid again: for whatſoever effect is wrought meerly by means, muſt bear proportion to, and cannot exceed the vertue of the means, by which it is wrought: As nothing by water can be made more cold than water, nor by fire more hot than fire, nor by honey more ſweet than honey, nor by gall more bitter than gall: Or if you will ſuppoſe it infuſed without

out means, then that power which infuſeth into the underſtanding aſſent which bears Analogy to ſight in the eye, muſt alſo infuſe evidence, that is, Viſibility into the Object: and look what degree of aſſent is infuſed into the underſtanding, at leaſt the ſame degree of evidence muſt be infuſed into the Object. And for you to require a ſtrength of credit beyond the appearance of the Objects credibility, is all one as if you ſhould require me to go Ten Miles an hour upon a Horſe that will go but five: to diſcern a man certainly through a miſt or cloud that makes him not certainly diſcernable; To hear a ſound more clearly than it is audible; to underſtand a thing more fully than it is intelligible: and he that doth ſo, I may well expect that his next injunction will be, that I muſt ſee ſomething that is inviſible, hear ſomething inaudible, underſtand ſomething that is wholly unintelligible. For he that demands ten of me, knowing I have but five, does in effect, as if he demanded five, knowing that I have none: and by like reaſon, you requiring that I ſhould ſee things farther than they are viſible, require I ſhould ſee ſomething inviſible, and in requiring that I believe ſomething more firmly than it is made to me evidently credible, you require in effect that I believe ſomething which appears to me incredible, and while it does ſo. I deny not but that I am bound to believe the truth of many Texts of Scripture the ſenſe whereof is to me obſcure and the Truth of many Articles of Faith the manner whereof is obſcure, and to humane underſtandings incomprehenſible; But then it is to be obſerved, that not the ſenſe of ſuch Texts, not the manner of theſe things is that which I am bound to believe, but the truth of them. But that I ſhould believe the Truth of any thing, the truth whereof cannot be made evident with an evidence proportionable to the degree of Faith required of me, this I ſay for any man to be bound to, is unjuſt and unreaſonable, becauſe to do it is impoſſible.

8. Ad §. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.] Yet though I deny that it is required of us to be certain in the higheſt degree, infallibly

infallibly certain of the truth of the things which we believe, for this were to know and not believe, neither is it poſſible unleſs our evidence of it, be it natural or ſupernatural, were of the higheſt degree; yet I deny not but that we are to believe the Religion of Chriſt, we are and may be infallibly certain. For firſt, this is moſt certain, that we are in all things to do according to wiſdom and reaſon rather than againſt it. Secondly, this is as certain, That wiſdom and reaſon require that we ſhould believe theſe things which are by many degrees more credible and probable than the contrary. Thirdly, this is as certain, that to every man who conſiders impartially what great things may be ſaid for the truth of Chriſtianity, and what poor things they are which may be ſaid againſt it, either for any other Religion or for none at all, it cannot but appear by many degrees more credible, that Chriſtian Religion, is true than the contrary. And from all theſe premiſes, this concluſion evidently follows, that it is infallibly certain, that we are firmly to believe the truth of Chriſtian Religion.

9. Your diſcourſe therefore touching the fourth requiſite to Faith which is Prudence, I admit ſo far as to grant. 1. That if we were required to believe with certainty (I mean a Moral certainty,) things no way repreſented as infallible and certain, (I mean Morally,) an unreaſonable obedience were required of us. And ſo likewiſe were it, were wer equired to believe as abſolutely certain, that which is no way repreſented to us as abſolutely certain. 2. That whom God obligeth to believe any thing, he will not fail to furniſh their underſtandings with ſuch inducements, as are ſufficient (it they be not negligent or perverſe) to perſuade them to believe. 3. That there is an abundance of Arguments exceedingly credible, inducing men to believe the Truth of Chriſtianity: I ſay ſo credibile, that though they cannot make us evidently ſee what we believe, yet they evidently convince that in true Wiſdom and Prudence, the Articles of it deſerve credit, and ought to be accepted as things revealed by God. 4. That without ſuch reaſons and inducements, our choice even of the true Faith, is not to be commended

mended as prudent, but to be condemned of raſhneſs and levity.

10. But then for your making Prudence, not only a commendation of a believer, and a juſtification of his Faith, but alſo eſſential to it, and part of the definition of it, in that, queſtionleſs you were miſtaken, and have done as if being to ſay what a man is, you ſhould define him, A Reaſonable creature that hath skill in Aſtronomy. For as all Aſtronomers are men, but all men are not Aſtronomers, and therefore Aſtronomy ought not to be put into the definition of men, where nothing ſhould haye place, but what agrees to all men: So though all that are truly wiſe (that is, wiſe for Eternity,) will believe aright, yet many may believe aright which are not wiſe. I could wiſh with all my Heart as *Moſes* did, *that all the Lords People could Propheſie*: That all that believe the true Religion *were able* (according to S. *Peters* injunction) *to give a reaſon of the hope that is in them*, a reaſon why they hope for Eternal Happineſs by this way rather than any other! neither do I think it any great difficulty that men of ordinary capacities, if they would give their mind to it, might quickly be enabled to do ſo. But ſhould I affirm that all true believers can do ſo, I ſuppoſe it would be as much againſt experience and modeſty, as it is againſt Truth and Charity, to ſay as you do, that *they which cannot do ſo, either are not at all, or to no purpoſe true believers.* And thus we ſee that the foundations you build upon, are ruinous and deceitful, and ſo unfit to ſupport your Fabrick that they deſtroy one another. I come now to ſhew that your Arguments to prove *Proteſtants Hereticks* are all of the ſame quality with your former grounds: which I will do by oppoſing clear and ſatisfying Anſwers in order to them.

11. Ad §. 13.) To the firſt then, delivered by you §. 13. *That* Proteſtants *muſt be* Hereticks, *becauſe they oppoſed divers Truths propounded for Divine by the Viſible Church*: I Anſwer, It is not *Hereſie* to oppoſe any Truth propounded by the Church, but only ſuch a Truth as is an eſſential part of the Goſpel of Chriſt. 2. The Doctrines which *Proteſtants* oppoſed, were not Truths, but plain

plain and impious falſhoods: Neither thirdly, were they propounded as Truths by the Viſible Church, but only by a Part of it, and that a corrupted Part.

12. Ad §. 14. The next *Argument, in the next Particle tells us*, That *every error againſt any doctrin revealed by God is damnable Hereſie: Now either Proteſtants or the* Roman *Church muſt err againſt the word of God: But the* Roman *Church* we *grant (perforce) doth not err damnably, neither can ſhe, becauſe ſhe is the Catholick Church, which* we (you ſay) *confeß cannot err damnably: Therefore Proteſtants muſt err againſt Gods word, and conſequently are guilty of formal Hereſie.* Whereunto I anſwer plainly, that there be in this argument almoſt as many falſhoods as aſſertions. For neither is every error againſt any Doctrin revealed by God a damnable Hereſie, unleſs it be revealed publickly, and plainly with a command that all ſhould believe it. 2. D. *Potter* no where grants, that the Errors of the *Roman* Church are *not in themſelves damnable*, though he hopes by accident they may not actually damn ſome men amongſt you: and this you your ſelf confeſs in divers places of your book, where you tell us, that he *allows no hope of Salvation to thoſe amongſt you, whom ignorance cannot excuſe.* 3. You beg the Queſtion twice in taking for granted, Firſt that *the* Roman *Church is the truly Catholick Church*; which without much favour can hardly paſs for a part of it: And again, that the *Catholick Church cannot fall into any error of it ſelf damnable:* for it may do ſo, and ſtill be the Catholick Church, if it retain thoſe Truths which may be an antidote againſt the malignity of this error, to thoſe that held it out of a ſimple un-affected ignorance. Laſtly, though the thing be true, yet I might well require ſome proof of it from you, that either *Proteſtants* or the *Roman* Church muſt err againſt Gods word. For if their contradiction be your only reaſon, then alſo you or the *Dominicans* muſt be *Hereticks*, becauſe you contradict one another as much as *Proteſtants* and *Papiſts*.

13. Ad §. 15. The third Argument pretends that *you have ſhewed already, that the Viſible Church is Judge of Controverſies, and therefore Infallible*; *from whence you ſuppoſe that*

it follows, that to oppoſe her, is to oppoſe God. To which I anſwer, that you have ſaid onely, and not ſhewed that *the Viſible Church is Judge of Controverſies.* And indeed how can ſhe be judge of them if ſhe cannot decide them? And how can ſhe decide them, if it be a queſtion whether ſhe be judge of them? That which is queſtioned it ſelf, cannot with any ſenſe be pretended to be fit to decide other queſtions; and much leſs this queſtion, whether it have Authority to judge and decide all queſtions? 2. If ſhe were judge, it would not follow that ſhe were infallible, for we have many Judges in our Courts of Judicature, yet none infallible. Nay you cannot with any modeſty deny, that every man in the world ought to judge for himſelf, what Religion is trueſt, and yet you will not ſay that every man is infallible. 3. If the Church were ſuppoſed Infallible, yet it would not follow at all, much leſs manifeſtly, that to oppoſe her declaration is to oppoſe God: unleſs you ſuppoſe alſo that as ſhe is infallible, ſo by her oppoſers, ſhe is known or believed to be ſo. Laſtly, If all this were true (as it is all moſt falſe) yet were it to little purpoſe, ſeeing you have omitted to prove that the Viſible Church is the *Roman.*

14. Ad §. 16. Inſtead of a fourth Argument this is preſented to us, *That if* Luther *were an Heretick, then they that agreed with him muſt be ſo.* And that *Luther* was a formal Heretick, you endeavor to prove by this moſt formal Syllogiſm; *To ſay the Viſible Church is not Univerſal, is properly an Hereſie: but* Luthers *Reformation was not Univerſal, Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie.* Whereunto I Anſwer, firſt to the firſt part, that it is no way impoſſible that *Luther*, had he been the inventer and firſt broacher of a falſe Doctrin, (as he was not) might have been a formal Heretick, and yet that thoſe who follow him may be only ſo materially and improperly, and indeed no Hereticks. Your own men out of S. *Auguſtin* diſtinguiſh between *Hæretici & Hæreticorum ſequaces*: And you your ſelf though you pronounce *the leaders among the* Arrians *formal Hereticks*, yet confeſs that *Salvian* was at leaſt doubtful whether theſe *Arrians*, who in ſimplicity followed

ed their Teachers, might not be excuſed by ignorance. And about this ſuſpenſion of his you alſo ſeem ſuſpended, for you neither approve nor condemn it. Secondly, to the ſecond part I ſay, that had you not preſumed upon our ignorance in Logick as well as Metaphyſicks and School Divinity, you would never have obtruded upon us this rope of ſand for a formal Syllogiſm. It is even Couſin-German to this, To deny the Reſurrection is properly an Hereſie, But *Luthers* Reformation was not Univerſal, Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie! Or to this, To ſay the Viſible Church is not Univerſal is properly an Hereſie: But the preaching of the Goſpel at the beginning was not Univerſal; therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie. For as he whoſe Reformation is but particular, may yet not deny the Reſurrection, ſo may he alſo not deny the Churches Univerſality. And as the Apoſtles who preached the Goſpel in the beginning, did believe the Church Univerſal, though their preaching at the beginning was not ſo: So *Luther* alſo might and did believe the Church Univerſal, though his Reformation were but particular. I ſay he did believe it Univerſal, even in your own ſenſe, that is, Univerſal *de jure*, though not *de facto*. And as for univerſality in fact, he believed the Church much more Univerſal then his Reformation: For he did conceive (as appears by your own Allegations out of him) that only the Part reformed was the true Church, but alſo that they were Part of it who needed reformation. Neither did he ever pretend to make a new Church but to reform the old one. Thirdly and laſtly, to the firſt propoſition of this unſyllogiſtical ſyllogiſm, I anſwer, That to ſay the true Church is not always *de facto* univerſal, is ſo far from being an Hereſie, that it is a certain Truth known to all thoſe that know the world, and what Religions poſſeſs far the greater part of it. *Donatus* therefore was not to blame, for ſaying, that the Church might poſſibly be confined to *Africk*; but for ſaying without ground, that then it was ſo. And S. *Auſtin*, as he was in the right, in thinking that the Church was then extended farther than *Africk*; ſo was he in the wrong if he thought that

of neceſſity it always muſt be ſo; but moſt palpably miſtaken in conceiving that it was then ſpread over the whole earth, and known to all nations, which if paſſion did not trouble you, and make you forget how lately almoſt half the world was diſcovered, and in what eſtate it was then found, you would very eaſily ſee and confeſs.

16. *The* Donatiſts *might do ill in calling the Chair of* Rome *the Chair of Peſtilence, and the* Roman *Church an Harlot,* and yet the ſtate of the Church being altered, *Proteſtants* might do well to do ſo, and therefore though, *S.* Auſtin *might perhaps have reaſon to perſecute the* Donatiſts *for detracting from the Church,* and calling her Harlot, when ſhe was not ſo; yet you may have none to threaten D. *Potter* that you would perſecute him (as the Application of this place intimates you would,) if it were in your power: plainly ſhewing that you are a curſt Cow though your horns be ſhort, ſeeing the *Roman* Church is not now what it was in S. *Auſtins* time. And hereof the concluſion of your own book affords us a very pregnant teſtimony: where you tell us out of Saint *Auſtin,* that one grand impediment, which among many kept the ſeduced followers of the faction of *Donatus* from the Churches Communion, was a viſible calumny raiſed againſt the Catholicks, that *they did ſet ſome ſtrange thing upon their Altar. To how many* (ſaith Saint *Auſtin*) *did the reports of ill Tongues ſhut up the way to enter, who ſaid, that we put, I know not what upon the Altar?* Out of deteſtation of the calumny, and juſt indignation againſt it, he would not ſo much as name the impiety wherewith they were charged, and therefore by a Rhetorical figure calls it, *I know not what.* But compare with him *Optatus,* writing of the ſame matter, and you ſhall plainly perceive that this *(I know not what)* pretended to be ſet upon the Altar, was indeed a picture, which the *Donatiſts* (knowing how deteſtable a thing it was to all Chriſtians at that time, to ſet up any pictures in a Church to worſhip them, as your new faſhion is) bruited abroad to be done in the Churches of the Catholick Church. But what anſwer do S. *Auſtin* and *Optatus* make

make to this accuſation? Do they confeſs and maintain it? Do they ſay, as you would now, It is true we do ſet Pictures upon our Altar, and that not only for ornament or memory, but for worſhip alſo; but we do well to do ſo, and this ought not to trouble you, or affright you from our Communion? What other anſwer your Church could now make to ſuch an objection, is very hard to imagine: And therefore were your Doctrin the ſame with the Doctrin of the Fathers in this point, they muſt have anſwered ſo likewiſe. But they to the contrary not only deny the crime, but abhor and deteſt it. To little purpoſe therefore do you hunt after theſe poor ſhadows of reſemblances between us and the *Donatiſts*: unleſs you could ſhew an exact reſemblance between the preſent Church of *Rome* and the Ancient: which ſeeing by this, and many other particulars it is demonſtrated to be impoſſible; that Church which was then a Virgin may be now a Harlot, and that which was detraction in the *Donatiſts*, may be in *Proteſtants* a juſt accuſation.

18. But the main point you ſay is, that *ſince* Luthers *Reformed Church was not in being for divers Centuries before* Luther, *and yet was in the Apoſtles time, they muſt of neceſſity affirm heretically with the* Donatiſts, *that the true unſpotted Church of Chriſt periſhed, and that ſhe which remained on earth, was (O Blaſphemy!) an Harlot.* By which words it ſeems you are reſolute perpetually to confound *True* and *Unſpotted*; and to put no difference between a corrupted Church and none at all. But what is this, but to make no difference between a diſeaſed and a dead man? Nay what is it but to contradict your ſelves, who cannot deny but that ſins are as great ſtains and ſpots and deformities in the ſight of God, as errors; and confeſs your Church to be a Congregation of men, whereof every particular, not one excepted, (and conſequently the generality which is nothing but a collection of them) is polluted and defiled with ſin?

19. You ask, How *can the Church more truly be ſaid to periſh, than when ſhe is permitted to maintain a dammable Hereſie?* I Anſwer, ſhe may be more truly ſaid to periſh, when ſhe

ſhe is not only permitted to do ſo, but *de facto* doth maintain a damnable Hereſie. Again, ſhe may be more truly ſaid to periſh, when ſhe falls into an Hereſie, which is not only damnable in it ſelf, and *ex natura rei*, as you ſpeak, but ſuch an Hereſie, the belief of whoſe contrary Truth is neceſſary, not only *neceſſitate præcepti* but *medii*, and therefore the Hereſie ſo abſolutely and indiſpenſably deſtructive of ſalvation, that no ignorance can excuſe it, nor any general repentance, without a dereliction of it, can beg a pardon for it. Such an hereſie if the Church ſhould fall into, it might be more truly ſaid to periſh, than if it fell only into ſome hereſie of its own nature damnable. For in that ſtate all the members of it, without exception, all without mercy muſt needs periſh for ever: In this, although thoſe that might ſee the truth and would not, cannot upon any good ground hope for ſalvation, yet without queſtion, it might ſend many ſouls to heaven, who would gladly have embraced the Truth, but that they wanted means to diſcover it. Thirdly and laſtly, ſhe may yet more truly be ſaid to periſh when ſhe Apoſtates from Chriſt abſolutely, or rejects even thoſe Truths out of which her Hereſies may be reformed; as if ſhe ſhould directly deny *Jeſus to be the Chriſt*, or the Scripture to be the Word of God. Towards which ſtate of Perdition it may well be feared that the Church of *Rome* doth ſomewhat incline, by her ſuperinducing upon the reſt of her Errors the Doctrin of her own Infallibility, whereby her errors are made incurable; and by her pretending that the Scripture is to be interpreted according to her doctrin, and not her doctrin to be judged of by Scripture, whereby ſhe makes the Scripture uneffectuall for her Reformation.

20. Ad §. 18. I was very glad when I heard you ſay *The Holy Scripture and acient Fathers do aſſign Separation from the Viſible Church as a mark of Hereſie:* for I was in good hope, that no Chriſtian would ſo belie the Scripture, as to ſay ſo of it, unleſs he could have produced ſome one Text at leaſt, wherein this was plainly affirmed, or from whence it might be undoubtedly and undeniably collected. For aſſure your ſelf, good Sir, it is a very heinous crime

to

to ſay, *thus ſaith the Lord, when the Lord doth not ſay ſo.* I expected therefore ſome Scripture ſhould have been alledged, wherein it ſhould have been ſaid, *whoſoever ſeparates from the* Roman *Church is an Heretick*: or *the* Roman *Church is infallible*, or *the guide of Faith*: or at leaſt, *There ſhall be always ſome Viſible Church infallible in matters of Faith.* Some ſuch direction as this I hoped for: And I pray conſider whether I had not reaſon! The Evangeliſts and Apoſtles who wrote the New Teſtament, we all ſuppoſe were good men, and very deſirous to direct us the ſureſt and plaineſt way to Heaven; we ſuppoſe them likewiſe very ſufficiently inſtructed by the Spirit of God in all the neceſſary points of the Chriſtian Faith, and therefore certainly not ignorant of this *Unum Neceſſarium*, this moſt neceſſary point of all others, without which as you pretend and teach, all faith is no Faith, that is, that *the Church of* Rome *was deſigned by God the guide of Faith.* We ſuppoſe them laſtly wiſe men, eſpecially being aſſiſted by the ſpirit of wiſdom, and ſuch as knew that a doubtful and queſtionable guide was for mens direction as good as none at all. And after all theſe ſuppoſitions, which I preſume no good Chriſtian will call into queſtion, is it poſſible that any Chriſtian heart can believe, that not one amongſt them all ſhould *ad rei memoriam* write this neceſſary doctrin plainly ſo much as once? Certainly in all reaſon they had provided much better for the good of Chriſtians if they had wrote this, though they had writ nothing elſe. Methinks the Evangeliſts undertaking to write the Goſpel of Chriſt, could not poſſibly have omitted, any one of them, this moſt neceſſary point of faith, had they known it neceſſary, (S. *Luke* eſpecially, who plainly profeſſeth that *his intent was to write all things neceſſary.*) Methinks S. *Paul* writing to the *Romans* could not but have congratulated this their Priviledge to them! Me thinks inſtead of ſaying, *Your Faith is ſpoken of all the world over* (which you have no reaſon to be very proud of, for he ſays the very ſame thing to the *Theſſalonians,*) he could not have failed to have told them once at leaſt in plain terms, that *their Faith was the Rule for all the World for ever.* But then ſure he would have forborn to put them

in

in fear of an impoſſibility, as he doth in his eleventh Chap. that they alſo, nay the whole Church of the *Gentiles if they did not look to their ſtanding, might fall away to infidelity* as the *Jews* had done. Methinks in all his other Epiſtles, at leaſt in ſome, at leaſt in one of them, he could not have failed to have given the world this direction, had he known it to be a true one, that *all men were to be guided by the Church of* Rome, *and none to ſeparate from it under pain of damnation.* Methinks writing ſo often of Hereticks and Antichriſt, he ſhould have given the world this (as you pretend) only ſure preſervative from them. How was it poſſible that S. *Peter* writing two Catholick Epiſtles, mentioning his own departure, writing to preſerve Chriſtians in the Faith, ſhould in neither of them commend them to the guidance of his pretended Succeſſors, the Biſhops of *Rome?* How was it poſſible that S. *James*, and S. *Jude* in their Catholick Epiſtles ſhould not give this Catholick direction? Methinks S. *John* inſtead of ſaying, *he that believeth that Jeſus is the Chriſt, is born of God*, (The force of which direction, your gloſſes do quite enervate, and make unavailable to diſcern who are the ſons of God,) ſhould have ſaid, *He that adheres to the doctrin of the* Roman *Church, and lives according to it, he is a good Chriſtian, and by this Mark ye ſhall know him!* What man not quite out of his wits, if he conſider as he ſhould, the pretended neceſſity of this doctrin, that without the belief hereof no man ordinarily can be ſaved, can poſſibly force himſelf to conceive that all theſe good and holy men, ſo deſirous of mens ſalvation, and ſo well aſſured of it (as it is pretended,) ſhould be ſo deeply and affectedly ſilent in it, and not one ſay it plainly ſo much as once, but leave it to be collected from uncertain principles, by many more uncertain conſequences? Certainly he that can judge ſo uncharitably of them, it is no marvel if he cenſure other inferior ſervants of Chriſt as Atheiſts, and Hypocrites, and what he pleaſes. Plain places therefore I did and had reaſon to look for, when I heard you ſay, *the holy Scripture aſſigns Separation from the viſible Church as a mark of Hereſie.* But inſtead hereof what have

have you brought us, but meer impertinences? S. *John* ſaith of ſome who pretended to be Chriſtians and were not ſo, and therefore when it was for their advantage forſook their Profeſſion, *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.* Of ſome, who before the decree of the Council to the contrary, were perſuaded and accordingly taught, that the convert Gentiles were to keep the Law of *Moſes*, it is ſaid in the *Acts*, *Some who went out from us.* And again S. *Paul* in the ſame Book forewarns the *Epheſians* that *out of them ſhould ariſe men ſpeaking perverſe things.* And from theſe places which it ſeems are the plaineſt you have, you collect *that ſeparation from the Viſible Church is aſſigned by Scripture as a Mark of* Hereſie. Which is certainly a ſtrange and unheard of ſtrain of Logick. Unleſs you will ſay that every Text wherein it is ſaid, that ſome Body goes out from ſome Body, affords an Argument for this purpoſe! For the firſt place there is no certainty that it ſpeaks of *Hereticks*, but, *no Chriſtians*, of *Antichriſts*, *of ſuch as denied Jeſus to be the Chriſt*: See the place and you ſhall confeſs as much. The ſecond place, it is certain, you muſt not ſay it ſpeaks of *Hereticks*, for it ſpeaks only of ſome who believed and taught an Error, while it was yet a queſtion and not evident, and therefore according to your Doctrine, no formal *Hereſie*. The third ſays indeed, that of the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, ſome ſhall ariſe that ſhall teach *Hereſie*: But not one of them all that ſays or intimates, that whoſoever ſeparates from the Viſible Church, in what ſtate ſoever, is certainly an *Heretick*. *Hereticks* I confeſs do always do ſo; But they that do ſo are not always *Hereticks*, for perhaps the State of the Church may make it neceſſary for them to do ſo; as Rebels always diſobey the command of their King, yet they which diſobey a Kings Command (which perhaps may be unjuſt) are not preſently Rebels.

22. In the 19. §. We have the Authority of eight Fathers urged to prove *that the ſeparation from the Church of* Rome *as it is the Sea of S.* Peter (I conceive you mean as it is the Particular Church) *is the mark of* Hereſie. Which kind of Argument I might well refuſe to anſwer,

unleſs you would firſt promiſe me, that whenſoever I ſhould produce as plain ſentences, of as great a number of Fathers, as Ancient, for any Doctrine whatſoever, that you will ſubſcribe to it, though it fall out to be contrary to the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church. For I conceive nothing in the World more unequal or unreaſonable, than that you ſhould preſs us with ſuch Authorities as theſe, and think your ſelves at liberty from them; and that you ſhould account them Fathers when they are for you, and Children when they are againſt you. Yet I would not you ſhould interpret this as if I had not great aſſurance, that it is not poſſible for you ever to gain this cauſe at the Tribunal of the Fathers, nay not of the Fathers whoſe ſentences are here alledged. Let us conſider them in order, and I doubt not to make it appear that far the greater part of them, nay all of them that are any way conſiderable fall ſhort of your purpoſe.

23. Obj. S. *Hierome* (you ſay Ep. 57. ad *Damaſum*) profeſſes, *I am in the Communion of the Chair of* Peter, *&c.* But then I pray conſider he ſaith it to *Pope Damaſus*: and this will much weaken the Authority, with them who know how great over-truths men uſually write to one another in letters. Conſider again, that he ſays only, that *he was then in Communion with the Chair of* Peter, Not that he always would, or of neceſſity muſt be ſo: for his reſolution to the contrary is too evident out of that which he ſaith elſwhere which ſhall be produced hereafter. He ſays that the *Church at that preſent was built upon that Rock*; but not that only, Nor that alwaies. Nay his judgment as ſhall appear is expreſs to the contrary. And ſo likewiſe the reſt of his expreſſions (if we mean to reconcile *Hierome* with *Hierome*) muſt be conceived as intended by him, of that Biſhop and Sea of *Rome*, at that preſent time, and in the preſent State, and in reſpect of that Doctrine which he there intreats of. For otherwiſe had he conceived it neceſſary for him and all men to conform their judgments in matters of Faith, to the judgment of the Biſhop and Church of *Rome*, how came it to paſs that he choſe rather to believe the Epiſtle to the

Hebrews

Hebrews Canonical, upon the Authority of the Eaſtern Church, than to reject it from the Canon upon the Authority of the *Roman*? How comes it to paſs that he diſſented from the Authority of that Church, touching the Canon of the *Old Teſtament*? For if you ſay, that the Church, then conſented with S. *Hierome*, I fear you will loſe your Fort by maintaining your Out-works, and by avoiding this, run into a greater danger of being forced to confeſs the preſent *Roman* Church oppoſite herein to the Ancient. How was it poſſible, that he ſhould ever believe that *Liberius* Biſhop of *Rome* either was or could have been wrought over by *the ſollicitation of Fortunatianus Biſhop of Aquileia, and brought after two Years Baniſhment to ſubſcribe* Hereſie? Which Act of *Liberius* though ſome fondly queſtion, being ſo vain as to expect we ſhould rather believe them that lived but yeſterday, thirteen hundred Years almoſt after the thing is ſaid to be done, and ſpeaking for themſelves in their own Cauſe, rather than the diſ-intereſſed time-fellows or immediate Succeſſors of *Liberius* himſelf: yet I hope they will not proceed to ſuch a degree of immodeſty, as once to queſtion whether S. *Hierome* thought ſo. And if this cannot be denied, I demand then if he had lived in *Liberius* his time, could he or would he have written ſo to *Liberius* as he does to *Damaſus*? would he have ſaid to him, *I am in the Communion of the Chair of* Peter, *I know that the Church is built upon this Rock, Whoſoever gathereth not with thee ſcattereth.* Would he then have ſaid, the *Roman* Faith and the *Catholick* were the ſame: or, that the *Roman* Faith received no deluſions, no not from an Angel? I ſuppoſe he could not have ſaid ſo with any coherence to his own belief; and therefore conceive it undeniable that what he ſaid then to *Damaſus*, he ſaid it (though perhaps he ſtrained too high) only of *Damaſus*, and never conceived that his words would have been extended to all his Predeceſſors and all his Succeſſors.

Hierom. de ſcrip. Eccle. tit. Fortunatianus.

24. Obj. S. *Ambroſe* (de obitu Satyri fratris) *ſaith* of his Brother *Satyrus*, that *inquiring for a Church wherein to give thanks for his delivery from Shipwreck, he called to him the*

Biſhop, and he asked him whether he agreed with the Catholick Biſhops, that is, *with the* Roman *Church? And when he underſtood that he was a Schiſmatick,* that is, *Separated from the* Roman *Church, he abſtained from Communicating with him.*

Anſw. No more can be certainly concluded from it, but that the *Catholick* Biſhops and the *Roman* Church were then at Unity; ſo that whoſoever agreed with the latter could not then but agree with the former. But that this Rule was perpetual, and that no man could ever agree with the *Catholick* Biſhops, but he muſt agree with the *Roman* Church, this he ſays not, nor gives you any ground to conclude from him. *Athanaſius* when he was excommunicated by *Liberius*, agreed very ill with the *Roman* Church, and yet you will not gainſay, but he agreed well enough with the *Catholick* Biſhops.

24. Obj. S. *Cyprian ſaith* (*Epiſt. 55. ad Cornel.*) They are bold to Sail to the *Chair of S.* Peter, *and to the principal Church, from whence Prieſtly Unity hath ſprung. Neither do they conſider that they are* Romans, *whoſe Faith was commended by the Preaching of the Apoſtle, to whom falſhood cannot have acceſs.*

Anſw. For S. *Cyprian* all the World knows that he [b] reſolutely oppoſed a Decree of the *Roman* Biſhop, and all that adhered to him in the point of Re-baptizing, which that Church at that time delivered as a neceſſary tradition. So neceſſary, that by the Biſhop of *Rome Firmilianus* and other Biſhops of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia* and *Galatia*, and generally all who perſiſted in the contrary opinion, [c] were therefore deprived of the Churches Communion, (which excommunication could not but involve S. *Cyprian*, who defended the ſame opinion as reſolutely as *Firmilianus*, though Cardinal *Perren* magiſterially and without all colour of proof affirm the contrary,) and *Cyprian* in particular ſo far caſt off, as for it to be pronounced by *Stephen a falſe Chriſt*. Again ſo neceſſary that the Biſhops which were ſent by *Cyprian* from *Africk* to *Rome*, were not admitted to the Communion of ordinary conference: But all men who were ſubject to the Biſhop of *Romes* Authority, were commanded by him not only to deny them the

[b] It is confeſſed by *Baronius Anno.* 238. N. 41. By *Bellarm. l.* 4. *de R. Pont. c.* 7. §. *Tertia ratio.*

[c] Confeſſed by *Baronius An.* 258. N. 14. & 15. By *Card. Perron.* Repl. *l.* 1. *c.* 25. *Ibid.*

the Churches peace and Communion, but even lodging and entertainment: manifeſtly declaring, that they reckoned them among thoſe whom S. *John* forbids *to receive to houſe, or to ſay God ſpeed to them.* All theſe terrors notwithſtanding S. *Cyprian* holds ſtill his former opinion, and though out of reſpect to the Churches peace [d] *he judged no man, nor cut off any man from the right of Communion, for thinking otherwiſe than he held,* yet he conceived *Stephen* and his adherents, [e] to hold a pernitious Error. And S. *Auſtin,* (though diſputing with the *Donatiſts* he uſeth ſome Tergiverſation in the point,) yet confeſſeth elſewhere, that *it is not found that* Cyprian *did ever change his opinion.* And ſo far was he from conceiving any neceſſity of doing ſo, in ſubmitting to the judgment of the Biſhop and Church of *Rome,* that he plainly profeſſeth that no other Biſhop, *but our Lord Jeſus only, had power to Judge* (with Authority) *of his Judgment,* and as plainly intimates that *Stephen,* for uſurping ſuch a power, and making himſelf *a Judge over Biſhops, was little better than a Tyrant:* and as heavily almoſt he cenſures him, and peremptorily oppoſes him as obſtinate in Error, in that very place where he delivers that famous ſaying, *How can he have God for his Father, who hath not the Church for his Mother?* little doubting it ſeems but a man might have the Church for his Mother, who ſtood in oppoſition to the Church of *Rome,* and far from thinking what you fondly obtrude upon him, that to be United to the *Roman* Church, and to the Church was all one, and that ſeparation from S. *Peters* Chair was a mark, I mean a certain mark, either of Schiſm or *Hereſie.*

[d] *Vide Con. Carth. apud ſur.* To. 1.

[e] *Bell. l.* 2. *de Conc. c.* 5. *Aug. ep.* 48. *& lib.* 1. *de Bapt. c.* 18.

26. But you have given a falſe or at leaſt a ſtrained Tranſlation of S. *Cyprians* forecited Words; for *Cyprian* ſaith not *to whom falſhood cannot have acceſs,* as if he had exempted the *Roman* Church from a poſſibility of Error, but to whom *perfidiouſneſs cannot have acceſs,* meaning thoſe perfidious Schiſmaticks, whom he there complains of; and of theſe by a Rhetorical inſinuation, he ſays that *with ſuch good Chriſtians as the* Romans *were, it was not poſſible they ſhould find favourable entertainment.* As for his joyning the *Principal Church* and the *Chair of* Peter, how that will

ſerve

ſerve to prove ſeparation from the *Roman* Church to be a mark of *Hereſie*, it is hard to underſtand. Though we do not altogether deny, but that the Church of *Rome* might be called the *Chair of S.* Peter, in regard he is ſaid to have Preached the Goſpel there; and the *principal Church*, becauſe the City was the principal and imperial City, which prerogative of the City, if we believe the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon*, was the ground and occaſion, why the Fathers of former times (I pray obſerve) conferred upon this Church this prerogative above other Churches.

27. Obj. *But in another place* (Epiſt. 52.) *S.* Cyprian *makes Communicating with* Cornelius (the Biſhop of *Rome*) *and with the* Catholick *Church to be the ſame.*

Anſw. This does not prove that to Communicate with the Church and *Pope* of *Rome*, and to Communicate with the *Catholick* Church, is *always* (for that you aſſume) one and the ſame thing. S. *Cyprian* ſpeaks not of the Church of *Rome* at all, but of the Biſhop only, who when he doth Communicate with the *Catholick* Church, as *Cornelius* at that time did, then whoſoever Communicates with him, cannot but Communicate with the *Catholick* Church: and then by accident one may truely ſay, ſuch a one Communicates with you, that is, with the *Catholick* Church, and that to Communicate with him is to Communicate with the *Catholick* Church. As if *Titius* and *Sempronius* be together, he that is in company with *Titius*, cannot but be at that time in company with *Sempronius*. As if a General be marching to ſome place with an Army, he that then is with the General muſt at that time be with the Army: And a man may ſay without abſurdity, ſuch a time I was with the General, that is, with the Army, and that to be with the General is to be with the Army. Or as if a mans hand be joyned to his Body, the finger which is joyned to the hand is joyned to the Body, and a man may ſay truly of it, this finger is joyned to the hand, that is, to the Body, and to be joyned to the hand is to be joyned to the Body; becauſe all theſe things are by accident true. And yet I hope you would not deny,

but

but the finger might poſſibly be joyned to the hand, and yet not to the Body, the hand being cut off from the Body; and a man might another time, be with his General and not with his Army, he being abſent from the Army. And therefore by like Reaſon your collection is Sophiſtical, being in effect but this, to communicate with ſuch a Biſhop of *Rome*, who did Communicate with the *Catholick* Church, was to Communicate with the *Catholick* Church, therefore abſolutely and always it muſt be true, that to Communicate with him, is by conſequent to Communicate with the *Catholick* Church, and to be divided from the Communion, is to be an *Heretick*.

28. Obj. *S.* Irenæus *ſaith*, (lib. 3. cont. hær: c. 3.) *Becauſe it were long to number the ſucceſſions of all Churches, we declaring the Tradition of the moſt great moſt Ancient and known Church, founded by the two glorious Apoſtles* Peter *and* Paul, *which Tradition it hath from the Apoſtles, coming to us by ſucceſſion of Biſhops, we confound all thoſe who any way either by vain Glory, Blindneſs, or ill Opinion do gather otherwiſe than they ought. For to this Church for a more powerful Principality, it is neceſſary that all Churches reſort, that is, all faithful People* (undique) *of what place ſoever: In which* (Roman Church) *the Tradition from the Apoſtles hath always been conſerved from thoſe who are* (undique) *every where.*

Anſw. Though at the firſt, hearing the Glorious Attributes here given (and that juſtly) to the Church of *Rome*, *the confounding* Hereticks *with her Tradition, and ſaying it is neceſſary for all Churches to reſort to her,* may ſound like Arguments for you: yet he that is attentive I hope will eaſily diſcover, that it might be good and rational in *Irenæus* having to do with Hereticks, who, ſomewhat like thoſe who would be the only *Catholicks*, declining a tryal by Scripture as not containing the Truth of Chriſt perfectly, and not fit to decide Controverſies without recourſe to Tradition: I ſay he will eaſily perceive that it might be rational in *Irenæus* to urge them with any Tradition of more credit than their own, eſpecially a Tradition conſonant to Scripture, and even contained in it; and yet that

it

it may be irrational in you to urge us, who do not decline Scripture but appeal to it as a perfect rule of Faith, with a Tradition which we pretend is many ways repugnant to Scripture, and repugnant to a Tradition far more general than it ſelf, which gives teſtimony to Scripture, and laſtly repugnant to it ſelf as giving atteſtation both to Scripture and to Doctrines plainly contrary to Scripture. Secondly, that the Authority of the *Roman* Church was then a far greater Argument of the Truth of her Tradition when it was United with all other Apoſtolick Churches, than now when it is divided from them, according to that of *Tertullian, Had the Churches Erred they would have varied, but that which is the ſame in all, cannot be Error but Tradition*; and therefore though *Irenæus* his Argument may be very probable, yet yours may be worth nothing. Thirdly, that fourteen hundred years may have made a great deal of alteration in the *Roman* Church: as Rivers, though near the Fountain they may retain their native and unmixt ſincerity, yet in long Progreſs cannot but take in much mixture that came not from the Fountain. And therefore the *Roman* Tradition though then pure, may now be corrupt and impure: and ſo this Argument (being one of thoſe things which are the worſe for wearing) might in *Irenæus* his time be ſtrong and vigorous, and after declining and decaying may long ſince have fallen to nothing. Eſpecially conſidering that *Irenæus* plays the Hiſtorian only and not the Prophet, and ſays only, that the *Apoſtolick Tradition had been always there as in other Apoſtolick Churches conſerved or obſerved*, chooſe you whether, but that *it ſhould be always ſo* he ſays not, neither had he any warrant. He knew well enough that there was foretold a *great falling away of* the Churches of Chriſt to Antichriſt: that the *Roman* Church in particular was forewarned that ſhe alſo, *nay the whole Church of the Gentiles, might fall if they look not to their ſtanding*: and therefore to ſecure her that ſhe ſhould ſtand for ever, he had no reaſon, nor Authority. Fourthly, that it appears manifeſtly out of this Book of *Irenæus* quoted by you, that the Doctrine of the *Chiliaſts* was in his Judgment Apoſtolick Tradition, as alſo

it

it was eſteemed (for ought appears to the contrary) by all the Doctors, and Saints, and Martyrs of or about his time, for all that ſpeak of it, or whoſe judgments in the point are any way recorded, are for it: and *Juſtin Martyr* profeſſeth, that *all good and Orthodox Chriſtians of his time believed it*, and thoſe that did not, he reckons amongſt Hereticks. Now I demand, was this Tradition one of thoſe that was conſerved, and obſerved in the Church of *Rome*, or was it not? If not, had *Iræneus* known ſo much, he muſt have retracted this commendation of that Church. If it was, then the Tradition of the preſent Church of *Rome* contradicts the Ancient, and accounts it Heretical, and then ſure it can be no certain note of Hereſie to depart from them, who have departed from themſelves, and prove themſelves ſubject unto error by holding contradictions. Fifthly and laſtly, that out of the Story of the Church it is as manifeſt as the light at noon, that though *Iræneus* did eſteem the *Roman* Tradition, a great Argument of the Doctrin which he there delivers and defends againſt the Hereticks of his time, *viz. that there was one God*, yet he was very far from thinking that Church was, and ever ſhould be a ſafe keeper, and an infallible witneſs of Tradition in general: Inaſmuch as in his own life, his action proclaimed the contrary. For when *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome* obtruded the *Roman* Tradition touching the time of *Eaſter* upon the *Aſian* Biſhops under the pain of Excommunication, *and damnation*, *Iræneus*, and all the other Weſtern Biſhops, though agreeing with him in his obſervation yet ſharply reprehended him for Excommunicating the *Aſian* Biſhops for their diſagreeing, plainly ſhewing, that they eſteemed that not a neceſſary doctrin and a ſufficient ground of excommunication, which the Biſhop of *Rome* and his adherents did ſo account of: For otherwiſe how could they have reprehended him for excommunicating them, had they conceived the cauſe of his excommunication juſt and ſufficient? And beſides evidently declaring that they eſteemed not ſeparation from the *Roman* Church a certain mark of Hereſie, ſeeing they eſteemed not them Hereticks though ſeparated and cut off from the *Roman* Church.

31. Obj. S. *Auſtin* ſaith (in Pſalm *cont. partem Donati*) *It grieves us to ſee you ſo to lie cut off. Number the Prieſts even from the Sea of* Peter; *and conſider in that order of Fathers who ſucceeded; to whom ſhe is the Rock which the proud gates of Hell do not overcome*: Where he ſeems to ſay, that the Succeſſion in the Sea of *Peter*, was the Rock which our Saviour means when he ſaid, *upon this Rock will I build my Church.*

Anſ. I anſwer, Firſt, We have no reaſon to be confident of the truth hereof, becauſe S. *Auſtin* himſelf was not, but retracts it as uncertain, and *leaves to the Reader whether he will think that, or another more probable.* Retr. *l.* 1. *c.* 26. Secondly, what he ſays of the Succeſſion in the *Roman* Church in this place, he ſays it elſewhere, of all the Succeſſions in all other Apoſtolick Churches. Thirdly, that as in this place he urgeth the *Donatiſts* with ſeparation from the *Roman* Church, as an argument of their Error: So elſewhere he preſſeth them with their Separation from other Apoſtolick Churches, nay more from theſe than from that, becauſe in *Rome* the *Donatiſts* had a Biſhop, though not a perpetual Succeſſion of them, but in other Apoſtolick Churches they wanted both. *Theſe ſcattered men* (ſaith he of the *Donatiſts* Epiſt. 165.) *read in the holy Books the Churches to which the Apoſtles wrote, and have no Biſhop in them: But what is more perverſe and mad, than to the Lectors reading theſe Epiſtles to ſay, Peace with you, and to ſeparate from the peace of theſe Churches, to which theſe Epiſtles were written?* So *Optatus* having done you (as it might ſeem) great ſervice, in upbraiding the *Donatiſts* as Schiſmaticks, becauſe they had not Communion with the Church of *Rome*, overthrows and undoes it all again, and as it were with a ſponge wipes out all that he had ſaid for you, by adding after, that they were Schiſmaticks, becauſe *they had not the fellowſhip of Communion with the ſeven Churches of* Aſia, *to which S.* John *writes*: whereof he pronounces confidently, (though I know not upon what ground) *Extra ſeptem Eccleſias quicquid foris eſt, alienum eſt.* Now I pray tell me, do you eſteem the Authority of theſe Fathers a ſufficient aſſurance, that ſeparation from theſe other

A-

Apoſtolick Churches, was a certain mark of Hereſie, or not? If ſo, then your Church hath been for many Ages heretical. If not, how is their authority, a greater argument for the *Roman*, than for the other Churches? If you ſay, they conceived ſeparation from theſe Churches a note of Schiſm, only when they were united to the *Roman*: ſo alſo they might conceive of the *Roman*, only when it was united to them. If you ſay, they urged this only as a probable, and not as a certain Argument, ſo alſo they might do that. In a word, whatſoever anſwer you can deviſe to ſhew, that theſe Fathers made not ſeparation from theſe other Churches a mark of Hereſie, apply that to your own Argument, and it will be ſatisfied.

33. You ſee S. *Auſtins* words make very little, or indeed nothing for you. But now his Action, (which according to Cardinal *Perrons* rule, is much more to be regarded than his words, as not being ſo obnoxious to miſinterpretation) [a] I mean his famous oppoſition of three Biſhops of *Rome* in Succeſſion, touching the great queſtion of Appeals, wherein he and the reſt of the *African* Biſhops proceeded ſo far in the firſt or ſecond *Milevitan* Council, as to [b] *decree any* African *Excommunicate, that ſhould appeal to any man out of* Africk, and therein continued reſolute unto death: I ſay this famous Action of his, makes clearly and evidently and infinitely againſt you. For had *Boniface*, and the reſt of the *African* Biſhops, a great part whereof were Saints and Martyrs, believed as an Article of Faith, that Union and Conformity with the Doctrin of the *Roman* Church, in all things which ſhe held neceſſary, was a certain note of a good Catholick, and by Gods command neceſſary to Salvation, how was it poſſible they ſhould have oppoſed it in this? Unleſs you will ſay they

[a] You do ill to tranſlate it, *the Principality of the Sea Apoſtolick*, as if there were but one: whereas S. *Auſtin* preſently after ſpeaks of Apoſtolical Churches, in the plural number, and makes the Biſhops of them, joynt Commiſſioners for the judging of Eccleſiaſtical cauſes.

[b] The words of the Decree (which alſo *Bellarmine* l. 1. *de Matrim.* c. 17. aſſures us to have been formed by S. *Auſtin*) are theſe. *Si qui (Africani,) ab Epiſcopo provocandum putaverint, non niſi ad Africana provocent Concilia, vel ad Primates provinciarum ſuarum. Ad tranſmarina autem, qui putaverit appellandum, à nullo intra Africam in Communionem ſuſcipiatur.* This Decree is by *Gratian* moſt impudently corrupted. For whereas the Fathers of that Council intended it particularly againſt the *Church of Rome*, he tells us they forbad Appeals to all, *excepting only the Church of Rome.*

were all ſo fooliſh as to believe at once direct contradictions, *viz.* that conformity to the *Roman* Church was neceſſary in all points, and not neceſſary in this: or elſe ſo horribly impious, as believing this doctrin of the *Roman* Church true, and her power to receive Appeals derived from divine Authority, notwithſtanding to oppoſe and condemn it, and to Anathematize all thoſe *Africans*, of what condition ſoever, that ſhould appeal unto it. I ſay *of what condition ſoever*: For it is evident, that they concluded in their determination, Biſhops as well as the inferior Clergy and Laity: And Cardinal *Perrons* pretence of the contrary, is a ſhameleſs falſhood, repugnant to the plain words of the Remonſtrance of the *African* Biſhops to *Celeſtine* Biſhop of *Rome*.

[a] The words are theſe, *Præfato debito ſalutationis officio, impendio deprecamur; ut deinceps ad aures veſtras hinc venientes, non facilius admittatis; nec à nobis excommunicatos ultra in Communionem velitis recipere, quia hoc etiam Niceno Concilio definitum facile advertet venerabilitas tua. Nam ſi de inferioribus Clericis vel Laicis videtur id præcaveri, quanto magis hoc de Epiſcopis voluit obſervari.*

34. Obj. *Tertullian* ſaith (Præſcrip. cap. 36.) *If thou be near* Italy, *thou haſt* Rome, *whoſe Authority is near at hand to us: a happy Church, into which the Apoſtles have poured all Doctrin, together with their blood.*

Anſ. Your allegation of *Tertullian* is a manifeſt conviction of your want of ſincerity: For you produce with great oſtentation what he ſays of the Church of *Rome*, but you and your fellows always conceal and diſſemble, that immediately before theſe words he attributes as much for point of direction to any other Apoſtolick Church, and that as he ſends them to *Rome* who lived near *Italy*, ſo thoſe near *Achaia* he ſends to *Corinth*, thoſe about *Macedonia* to *Philippi*, and *Theſſalonica*, thoſe of *Aſia* to *Epheſus*. His words are, *Go to now thou that wilt better imploy thy curioſity in the buſineſs of thy ſalvation, run over the Apoſtolical Churches, wherein the Chairs of the Apoſtles are yet ſate upon in their places, wherein their Authentick Epiſtles are recited, ſounding out the voyce, and repreſenting the face of every one! Is* Achaia *near thee? there thou haſt* Corinth: *If thou art not far from* Macedonia, *thou haſt* Philippi, *thou*

thou haſt Theſſalonica: *If thou canſt go into* Aſia, *there thou haſt* Epheſus: *If thou be adjacent to* Italy, *thou haſt* Rome, *whoſe Authority is near at hand to us* (in *Africk*;) *A happy Church, into which the Apoſtles poured forth all their Doctrine together with their Blood*, &c. Now I pray Sirtell me, if you can for bluſhing, why this place might not have been urged by a *Corinthian*, or *Philippian*, or *Theſſalonian*, or an *Epheſian*, to ſhew that in the Judgment of *Tertullian*, ſeparation from any of their Churches is a certain mark of Hereſie, as juſtly and rationally as you alledge it to vindicate this priviledge to the *Roman* Church only? Certainly if you will ſtand to *Tertullians* judgment, you muſt either grant the authority of the *Roman* Church (though at that time a good Topical Argument, and perhaps a better than any the Hereticks had, eſpecially in conjunction with other Apoſtolick Churches:) yet, I ſay you muſt grant it perforce but a Fallible Guide as well as that of *Epheſus*, and *Theſſalonica*, and *Philippi*, and *Corinth*: or you muſt maintain the authority of every one of theſe infallible, as well as the *Roman*. For though he make a *Panegyrick* of the *Roman* Church in particular, and of the reſt only in general, yet as I have ſaid, for point of direction he makes them all equal; and therefore makes them (chooſe you whether) either all fallible, or all infallible: Now you will and muſt acknowledge that he never intended to attribute infallibility to the Churches of *Epheſus*, or *Corinth*, or if he did, that (as experience ſhews) he Erred in doing ſo; and what can hinder, but then we may ſay alſo that he never intended to attribute infallibility to the *Roman* Church, or if he did that he Erred in doing ſo?

38. Ad §. 20, 21, 22, 23.] The ſum of your diſcourſe in theſe Sections, if it be pertinent to the Queſtion, muſt be this. *Want of Succeſſion of Biſhops and Paſtors holding always the ſame Doctrine, and of the forms of ordaining Biſhops and Prieſts which are in uſe in the* Roman *Church, is a certain mark of Hereſie: But* Proteſtants *want all theſe things: Therefore they are Hereticks.* To which I anſwer, That nothing but want of truth and holding Error, can make or prove any

any man or Church Heretical. For if he be a true *Ariſtotelian*, or *Platoniſt*, or *Pyrrhonian*, or *Epicurean*, who holds the Doctrine of *Ariſtotle*, or *Plato*, or *Pirrho*, or *Epicurus*, although he cannot aſſign any that held it before him for many Ages together, why ſhould I not be made a true and Orthodox Chriſtian, by believing all the Doctrine of Chriſt, though I cannot derive my deſcent from a perpetual Succeſſion that believed it before me? By this reaſon you ſhould ſay as well, that no man can be a good Biſhop or Paſtor, or King or Magiſtrate, or Father that ſucceeds a bad one. For if I may conform my will and actions to the Commandments of God, why may I not embrace his Doctrine with my underſtanding, although my predeceſſor do not ſo? You have above in this Chapter defined *Faith a free Infallible, obſcure, ſupernatural aſſent to Divine Truths, becauſe they are revealed by God and ſufficiently propounded:* This definition is very phantaſtical; but for the preſent I will let it paſs, and deſire you to give me ſome piece of ſhadow or reaſon, why I may not do all this without a perpetual Succeſſion of Biſhops and Paſtors that have done ſo before me? You may judge as uncharitably, and ſpeak as maliciouſly of me, as your blind zeal to your Superſtition ſhall direct you, but certainly I know, (and with all your Sophiſtry you cannot make me doubt of what I know,) that I do believe the Goſpel of Chriſt (as it is delivered in the undoubted Books of Canonical Scripture, as verily as that it is now day, that I ſee the light, that I am now writing: and I believe it upon this Motive, becauſe I conceive it ſufficiently, abundantly, ſuperabundantly proved to be Divine Revelation: And yet in this, I do not depend upon any Succeſſion of men that have always believed it without any mixture of Error; nay I am fully perſuaded, there hath been no ſuch Succeſſion, and yet do not find my ſelf any way weakned in my Faith by the want of it; but ſo fully aſſured of the truth of it, that not only, though your Devils at *Lowden* do tricks againſt it, but though an Angel from Heaven ſhould gainſay it or any part of it, I perſuade my ſelf that I ſhould not be moved. This I ſay, and this I am ſure is true: and if you will be ſo Hyper-

ſceptical

ſceptical as to perſuade me, that I am not ſure that I believe all this, I deſire you to tell me, how are you ſure that you believe the Church of *Rome?* For if a man may perſuade himſelf he doth believe what he doth not believe, then may you think you believe the Church of *Rome*, and yet not believe it. But if no man can Err concerning what he believes, then you muſt give me leave to aſſure my ſelf that I do believe, and conſequently that any man may believe the aforeſaid truths upon the aforeſaid motives, without any dependence upon any Succeſſion that hath believed it always. And as from your definition of Faith, ſo from your definition of Hereſie, this fancy may be refuted. For queſtionleſs no man can be an Heretick but he that holds an Hereſie, and an Hereſie you ſay *is a Voluntary Error*; therefore no man can be neceſſitated to be an Heretick whether he will or no, by want of ſuch a thing that is not in his power to have: But that there ſhould have been a perpetual Succeſſion of Believers in all points Orthodox, is not a thing which is in your power, therefore our being or not being Hereticks depends not on it. Beſides, what is more certain, than that he may make a ſtreight line, who hath a Rule to make it by, though never man in the World had made any before: and why then may not he that believes the Scripture to be the Word of God, and the Rule of Faith, regulate his Faith by it, and conſequently believe aright without much regarding what other men either will do or have done? It is true indeed there is a neceſſity that if God will have his Words believed, he by his Providence muſt take order, that either by Succeſſion of men, or by ſome other means natural or ſupernatural, it be preſerved and delivered, and ſufficiently notified to be his Word; but that this ſhould be done by a Succeſſion of men that holds no Error againſt it, certainly there is no more neceſſity, than that it ſhould be done by a Succeſſion of men that commit no ſin againſt it. For if men may preſerve the Records of a Law, and yet tranſgreſs it, certainly they may alſo preſerve directions for their Faith, and yet not follow them. I doubt not but Lawyers at the Barr do find by frequent experience,

that

that many men preserve and produce evidences, which being examined oftimes make against themselves. This they do ignorantly, it being in their power to suppress, or perhaps to alter them. And why then should any man conceive it strange, that an erroneous and corrupted Church should preserve and deliver the Scriptures uncorrupted, when indeed for many reasons which I have formally alleged, it was impossible for them to corrupt them? Seeing therefore this is all the necessity that is pretended of a perpetual Succession of men Orthodox in all points, certainly there is no necessity at all of any such, neither can the want of it prove any man or any Church Heretical.

39. When therefore you have produced some proof of this, (which was your Major in your former Syllogism,) That want of Succession is a certain mark of Heresie, you shall then receive a full answer to your Minor. We shall then consider whether your indelible Character be any reality, or whether it be a Creature of your own making, a fancy of your own imagination? And if it be a thing, and not only a Word, whether our Bishops and Priests have it not as well as yours; and whether some mens persuasion that there is no such thing, can hinder them from having it, or prove that they have it not if there be any such thing? (Any more than a mans persuasion that he has not taken Physick or Poyson, will make him not to have taken it if he has, or hinder the operation of it?) And whether *Tertullian* in the place quoted by you, speak of a Priest made a Lay-man, by a just deposition or degradation, and not by a voluntary desertion of his Order? And whether in the same place he set not some mark upon Hereticks that will agree to your Church? Whether all the Authority of our Bishops in *England* before the Reformation, was conferred on them by the *Pope*? And if it were, whether it were the *Popes* right, or an Usurpation? If it were his right, whether by Divine Law or Ecclesiastical? And if by Ecclesiastical only, whether he might possibly so abuse his power, as to deserve to lose it? Whether *de facto* he had done so? Whether supposing he had deserved to lose it, those that deprived him of it had power to take it from him?

him? Or if not, whether they had power to ſuſpend him from the uſe of it, until good caution were put in, and good aſſurance given, that if he had it again, he would not abuſe it as he had formerly done? Whether in caſe they had done unlawfully that took his power from him, it may not (things being now ſetled, and the preſent Government eſtabliſhed) be as unlawful to go about to reſtore it? whether it be not a Fallacy to conclude, becauſe we believe the *Pope* hath no power in *England*, now when the King and State and Church hath deprived him upon juſt grounds of it, therefore we cannot believe that he had any before his deprivation? Whether without Schiſm, a man may not withdraw obedience from an Uſurped Authority commanding unlawful things? Whether the *Roman* Church might not give Authority to Biſhops and Prieſts to oppoſe her Errors, as well as a King gives Authority to a Judge to judge againſt him, if his cauſe be bad; as well as *Trajan* gave his Sword to his Prefect, with this commiſſion, that *if he Governed well, he ſhould uſe it for him, if ill againſt.* Whether the *Roman* Church gave not Authority to her Biſhops and Prieſts to Preach againſt her corruptions in manners? And if ſo, why not againſt her Errors in Doctrine, if ſhe had any? Whether ſhe gave them not Authority to Preach the whole Goſpel of Chriſt, and conſequently againſt her Doctrine, if it ſhould contradict any part of the Goſpel of Chriſt? Whether it be not acknowledged lawful in the Church of *Rome*, for any Lay-man or Woman that has ability to perſuade others by Word or by Writing from Error, and unto truth? And why this Liberty may not be practiſed againſt their Religion, if it be falſe, as well as for it if it be true? Whether any man need any other Commiſſion or Vocation than that of a Chriſtian, to do a work of Charity? And whether it be not one of the greateſt works of Charity (if it be done after a peaceable manner, and without any unneceſſary diſturbance of order,) to perſuade men out of a falſe, unto a true way of Eternal happineſs? Eſpecially the Apoſtle having aſſured us, that he, (whoſoever he is) *who converteth a ſinner from the Error of his way, ſhall ſave a Soul from*

Death, and ſhall hide a multitude of Sins? Whether the firſt Reformed Biſhops died all at once, ſo that there were not enough to ordain others in the places that were vacant? Whether the Biſhops of *England* may not Conſecrate a Metropolitan of *England*, as well as the Cardinals do the *Pope?* whether the King or Queen of *England*, or they that have the Government in their Hands, in the minority of the Prince, may not lawfully commend one to them to be conſecrated, againſt whom there is no Canonical exception? Whether the Doctrine, that the King is ſupream head of the Church of *England*, (as the Kings of *Judah*, and the firſt Chriſtian Emperors were of the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church,) be any new found Doctrine? Whether it be not true, that Biſhops being made Biſhops, have their Authority immediately from Chriſt, though this or that man be not made Biſhop without the Kings Authority; as well as you ſay, the *Pope* being *Pope*, has Authority immediately from Chriſt, and yet this or that man cannot be made *Pope* without the Authority of the Cardinals? Whether you do well to ſuppoſe, that Chriſtian Kings have no more Authority in ordering the affairs of the Church, than the great *Turk*, or the *Pagan* Emperors? Whether the King may not give Authority to a Biſhop to exerciſe his function in ſome part of his Kingdom, and yet not be capable of doing it himſelf: as well as a Biſhop may give Authority to a Phyſician, to practice Phyſick in his Dioceſs, which the Biſhop cannot do himſelf? Whether if *Nero* the Emperor would have commanded S. *Peter* or S. *Paul* to Preach the Goſpel of Chriſt, and to exerciſe the office of a Biſhop of *Rome*, whether they would have queſtioned his Authority to do ſo? Whether there were any Law of God or man, that prohibited K. JAMES to give Commiſſion to Biſhops, nay to lay his injunction upon them, to do any thing that is lawful? Whether a caſual irregularity may not be lawfully diſpenced with? Whether the *Popes* irregularities if he ſhould chance to incur any, be indiſpenſable? And if not, who is he, or who are they, whom the *Pope* is ſo ſubject unto, that they may diſpenſe with him? Whether that

that be certain which you take for granted; *That your Ordination imprints a Character and ours doth not?* Whether the power of Conſecrating and Ordaining by impoſition of hands, may not reſide in the Biſhops, and be derived unto them, not from the King but God; and yet the King have Authority to command them to apply this power to ſuch a fit perſon, whom he ſhall commend unto them: As well as if ſome Architects only had the faculty of *Architecture*, and had it immediately by infuſion from God himſelf, yet, if they were the Kings Subjects, he wants not authority to command them to build him a Palace for his uſe, or a fortreſs for his ſervice: Or as the King of *France* pretends not to have power to make Prieſts himſelf, yet I hope, you will not deny him power to command any of his Subjects that has this power, to ordain any fit perſon Prieſt, whom he ſhall deſire to be ordained? Whether it do not follow, that whenſoever the King commands an Houſe to be Built, a Meſſage to be delivered, or a Murtherer to be Executed, that all theſe things are preſently done without intervention of the Architect, Meſſenger, or Executioner: As well as, that they are *ipſo facto* Ordained and Conſecrated, who by the Kings Authority are commended to the Biſhops to be Ordained and Conſecrated: Eſpecially ſeeing the King will not deny, but that theſe Biſhops may refuſe to do what he requires to be done, lawfully if the perſon be unworthy, if worthy, unlawfully indeed, but yet *de facto* they may refuſe: and in caſe they ſhould do ſo, whether juſtly or unjuſtly; neither the King himſelf, nor any Body elſe, would eſteem the perſon Biſhop upon the Kings deſignation? Whether many *Popes*, though they were not Conſecrated Biſhops by any temporal Prince, yet might not, or did not receive authority from the Emperor to exerciſe their Epiſcopal function in this or that place? And whether the Emperors had not authority, upon their deſert, to deprive them of their juriſdiction, by impriſonment or baniſhment? Whether Proteſtants do indeed pretend that their Reformation is Univerſal? Whether in ſaying, the *Donatiſts Sect was confined to* Africa, you do not forget your ſelf, and con-

tradict what you ſaid above, in §. 17. of this Chapter, where you tell us, *they had ſome of their Sect reſiding in* Rome? Whether it be certain, that none can admit of Biſhops willingly, but thoſe that hold them of Divine inſtitution? Whether they may not be willing to have them, conceiving that way of Government the beſt, though not abſolutely neceſſary? Whether all thoſe *Proteſtants* that conceive the diſtinction between Prieſts and Biſhops, not to be of Divine inſtitution, be Schiſmatical and Heretical for thinking ſo? Whether your form of ordaining Biſhops and Prieſts, be eſſential to the conſtitution of a true Church? Whether the forms of the Church of *England* differ eſſentially from your forms? Whether in ſaying, that *the true Church cannot ſubſiſt without undoubted true Biſhops and Prieſts*, you have not overthrown the truth of your own Church: wherein I have proved it plainly impoſſible, that any man ſhould be ſo much as morally certain, either of his own Prieſthood or any other mans? Laſtly, whether any one kind of theſe external Forms and Orders, and Government be ſo neceſſary to the being of a Church, but that they may not be diverſe in diverſe places, and that a good and peaceable Chriſtian may and ought to ſubmit himſelf to the Government of the place where he lives whatſoever it be? All theſe Queſtions will be neceſſary to be diſcuſſed for the clearing of the truth of the *Minor* propoſition of your former Syllogiſm, and your proofs of it: and I will promiſe to debate them fairly with you, if firſt you will bring ſome better proof of the *Major*, *That want of Succeſſion is a certain note of Hereſie*, which for the preſent remains both unproved and unprobable.

40. *Obj.* You ſay, *The Fathers aſſign Succeſſion as one mark of the true Church.*

Anſw. I confeſs they did urge Tradition as an Argument of the Truth of their Doctrine and of the falſhood of the contrary; and thus far they agree with you. But now ſee the difference: They urged it not againſt all Hereticks that ever ſhould be, but againſt them who rejected a great part of the Scripture, for no other reaſon but *becauſe it was repugnant to their Doctrine, and corrupted other parts with*

with their additions and detractions, and perverted the remainder with divers abſurd interpretations: So *Tertullian* not a leaf before the words by you cited. Nay they urged it againſt them who *when they were confuted out of Scripture, fell to accuſe the Scriptures themſelves as if they were not right, and came not from good authority, as if they were various one from another, and as if truth could not be found out of them, by thoſe who know not Tradition, for that it was not delivered in writing;* (they did mean wholly,) *but by word of mouth: And that thereupon* Paul *alſo ſaid, we ſpeak wiſdom amongſt the perfect.* So *Irenæus* in the very next Chapter before that which you alledge. Againſt theſe men being thus neceſſitated to do ſo, they did urge Tradition, but what or whoſe Tradition was it? Certainly no other but the joynt Tradition of all the Apoſtolick Churches, with one Mouth and one Voice teaching the ſame Doctrine. Or if for brevity ſake they produce the Tradition of any one Church, yet is it apparent, that that one was then in conjunction with all the reſt; *Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen,* teſtifie as much in the words cited, and S. *Auſtin,* in the place before alledged by me. This Tradition they did urge againſt theſe men, and in a time, in compariſon of ours, almoſt contiguous to the Apoſtles: So near, that one them, *Irenæus,* was Scholar to one who was Scholar to S. *John* the Apoſtle. *Tertullian* and *Origen* were not an Age removed from him: and the laſt of them all, little more than an Age from them. Yet after all this they urged it not as a demonſtration, but only as a very probable argument, far greater than any their Adverſaries could oppoſe againſt it. So *Tertullian* in the place above quoted, §. 5. *How is it likely that ſo many and ſo great Churches ſhould Err in one Faith?* (it ſhould be, ſhould have Erred into one Faith.) And this was the condition of this Argument as the Fathers urged it. Now if you having to deal with us, who queſtion no Book of Scripture, which was not Anciently queſtioned by ſome whom you your ſelves eſteem good Catholicks; nay who refuſe not to be tried by your own Canons, your own Tranſlations, who in interpreting Scriptures are content to allow of all thoſe rules which you propoſe, only except

except that we will not allow you to be our Judges; if you will come fifteen hundred years after the Apoſtles, a fair time for the pureſt Church to gather much droſs and corruptions, and for the *myſtery of iniquity* to bring its work to ſome perfection, which *in the Apoſtles time began to work*, If (I ſay) you will come thus long after and urge us with the ſingle Tradition of one of theſe Churches, being now Catholick to it ſelf alone, and Heretical to all the reſt: nay not only with her Ancient Original Traditions, but alſo with her poſt-nate and introduced Definitions, and theſe as we pretend, repugnant to Scripture, and Ancient Tradition, and all this to decline an indifferent Trial by Scripture, under pretence (wherein alſo you agree with the calumny of the Old Hereticks) that *all neceſſary truth cannot be found in them without recourſe to Tradition*: If, I ſay, notwithſtanding all theſe differences, you will ſtill be urging us with this argument, as the very ſame and of the ſame force with that wherewith the fore-mentioned Fathers urged the Old Hereticks, certainly this muſt needs proceed from a confidence you have, not only that we have no School-Divinity, nor Metaphyſicks, but no Logick or common ſenſe, that we are but Pictures of men, and have the definition of rational creatures given us in vain.

41. But now ſuppoſe I ſhould be liberal to you, and grant what you cannot prove, that the Fathers make Succeſſion a certain and perpetual mark of the true Church; I beſeech you what will come of it? What, that want of Succeſſion is a certain ſign of an Heretical company? Truly if you ſay ſo, either you want Logick, which is a certain ſign of an ill diſputer; or are not pleaſed to uſe it, which is a worſe. For ſpeech is a certain ſign of a living man, yet want of ſpeech is no ſure argument that he is dead, for he may be dumb and yet living ſtill, and we may have other evident tokens that he is ſo, as Eating, Drinking, Breathing, Moving: So, though the conſtant and Univerſal delivery of any Doctrine by the Apoſtolick Churches ever ſince the Apoſtles, be a very great argument of the truth of it, yet there is no certainty, but

that

that truth, even Divine truth, may through mens wickedneſs, be contracted from its univerſality, and interrupted in its perpetuity, and ſo loſe this argument, and yet not want others to juſtifie and ſupport it ſelf. For it may be one of thoſe principles which God hath written in all mens Hearts, or a concluſion evidently ariſing from them: It may be either contained in Scripture in expreſs terms, or deducible from it by apparent conſequence. If therefore you intend to prove want of a perpetual Succeſſion of Profeſſors a certain note of Hereſie, you muſt not content your ſelf to ſhew, that having it is one ſign of truth; but you muſt ſhew it to be the only ſign of it and inſeparable from it. But this, if you be well adviſed, you will never undertake. Firſt becauſe it is an impoſſible attempt: and then becauſe if you do it you will marr all: for by proving this an inſeparable ſign of Catholick Doctrine, you will prove your own, which apparently wants it in many points, not to be Catholick. For whereas you ſay *this Succeſſion requires two things, agreement with the Apoſtles Doctrine, and an uninterrupted conveyance of it down to them that challenge it:* It will be proved againſt you that you fail in both points; and that ſome things wherein you agree with the Apoſtles have not been held alwaies, as your condemning the Doctrine of the *Chiliaſts*, and holding the Euchariſt not neceſſary for Infants; and that in many other things you agree not with them nor with the Church for many Ages after. For example; In mutilation of the Communion, in having your Service in ſuch a Language as the Aſſiſtants generally underſtand not, your offering to Saints, your Picturing of God, your worſhiping of Pictures.

42. Ad §. 24.] Obj. *The true Church muſt have Univerſality of place which* Proteſtants *wanting cannot avoid the juſt note of Hereſie.*

Anſw. You have not ſet down clearly and univocally what you mean by it, whether Univerſality of fact or of right: and if of fact, whether abſolute or comparative: and if comparative, whether of the Church in compariſon of any other Religion, or only of Heretical Chriſtians: or if in compariſon of theſe, whether in compariſon

of

of all other Sects conjoyned, or in compariſon only of any one of them. Nor have you proved it by any good argument in any ſenſe to be a certain mark of Hereſie: For thoſe places of S. *Auſtin* do not deſerve the name. And truly in my judgment you have done adviſedly in proving it no better. For as for Univerſality of right, or a right to Univerſality, all Religions claim it, but only the true has it, and which has it cannot be determined, unleſs it firſt be determined which is the true. An abſolute Univerſality, and diffuſion through all the World if you ſhould pretend to, all the World would laugh at you. If you ſhould contend for latitude with any one Religion, *Mahumetiſm* would carry the Victory from you. If you ſhould oppoſe your ſelves againſt all other Chriſtians beſides you, it is certain you would be caſt in this ſuit alſo. If laſtly, being hard driven you ſhould pleaſe your ſelves with being more than any one Sect of Chriſtians, it would preſently be replied, that it is uncertain whether now you are ſo, but moſt certain that the time has been when you have not been ſo. Then when the [a] *whole World wondered that it was become Arrian:* then when *Athanaſius oppoſed the World, and the World Athanaſius*: then when [b] *your Liberius* having the contemptible paucity of his adherents objected to him as a note of Error, anſwered for himſelf, *There was a time when there were but three oppoſed the decree of the King, and yet thoſe three were in the right, and the reſt in the wrong*: then when the *Profeſſors of Error ſurpaſſed the number of the Profeſſors of truth in proportion, as the ſands of the Sea do the Stars of the Heaven.* (As [c] S. *Auſtin* acknowledgeth:) then when [d] *Vincentius* confeſſeth, that *the Poyſon of the Arrians had contaminated, not now ſome certain portion, but almoſt the whole World:* then when the Author of *Nazianzens* Life teſtifies, *That* [e] *the Hereſie of* Arrius, *had poſſeſſed in a manner the whole extent of the World*; and when *Nazianzen* found cauſe to cry out, [f] *Where are they who reproach us with our poverty, who define the Church by the multitude, and deſpiſe the little flock? They have the People, but we the Faith.* And laſtly when *Athanaſius* was ſo overborn with Sholes and Floods of *Arrians*,

[a] *Hierom. Cont. Luciferianos.*

[b] *In Theodoret. Hiſt. 16. c. l. 2.*

[c] *In ep. 48. ad Vincentium.*

[d] *Commenitorii. lib. 1. c. 4.*

[e] *In vita Nazianz.*

[f] *In Orat. Arian. & pro ſeipſo.*

Arrians, that he was enforced to write a Treatiſe on purpoſe [s] againſt thoſe, *who judge of the truth only by plurality of adherents.* So that if you had proved want of Univerſality even thus reſtrained, to be an infallible note of Hereſie, there would have been no remedy but you muſt have confeſſed, that the time was when you were Hereticks. And beſides, I ſee not how you would have avoided this great inconvenience, of laying grounds and ſtoreing up arguments for Antichriſt, againſt he comes, by which he may prove his Company the true Church. For it is evident out of Scripture, and confeſſed by you, that though his time be not long, his dominion ſhall be very large; and that the true Church ſhall be then, the *woman driven into the wilderneſs.*

[s] *Tom.* 2.

45. *Ad* §. 25. 26.] You endeavor to prove that the Faith of Proteſtants is no Faith, being deſtitute of its due qualifications.

Obj. *Firſt*, you ſay, *their belief wanteth certainty, becauſe they denying the Univerſal Infallibility of the Church, can have no certain ground to know what Objects are revealed or teſtified by God.*

Anſ. But if there be no other ground of certainty but your Churches infallibility, upon what certain ground do you know that your Church is infallible? Upon what certain ground do you know all thoſe things which muſt be known before you can know that your Church is infallible? As that there is a God: that God hath promiſed his aſſiſtance to your Church in all her Decrees: that the Scripture wherein this promiſe is extant is the word of God: that thoſe Texts of Scripture which you alledge for your infallibility are incorrupted: that that which you pretend is the true ſenſe of them? When you have produced certain grounds for all theſe things, I doubt not but it will appear, that we alſo may have grounds certain enough to believe our whole Religion, which is nothing elſe but the Bible, without dependence on the Churches infallibility. Suppoſe you ſhould meet with a man that for the preſent, believes neither Church, nor Scripture, nor God, but is ready and willing to believe them all, if you can

ſhew ſome ſufficient grounds to build his faith upon; will you tell ſuch a man there are no certain grounds, by which he may be converted; or there are? If you ſay the firſt, you make all Religion an uncertain thing: If the ſecond, then either you muſt ridiculouſly perſwade, that your Church is infallible, becauſe it is infallible, or elſe that there are other certain grounds beſides your Churches infallibility.

46. Obj. *The Holy Scripture is in it ſelf moſt true and infallible, but without the direction and declaration of the Church, we can neither have certain means to know what Scripture is Canonical, nor what Tranſlations be faithful, nor what is the true meaning of Scripture.*

Anſ. But all theſe things muſt be known, before we can know the direction of your Church to be infallible, for no other proof of it can be pretended, but only ſome Texts of Canonical Scripture, truly interpreted: Therefore either you are miſtaken, in thinking there is no other means to know theſe things, but your Churches infallible direction, or we are excluded from all means of knowing her direction to be infallible.

47. Obj. *But Proteſtants, though they are perſwaded their own opinions are true, and that they have uſed ſuch means as are wont to be preſcribed for underſtanding the Scripture, as Prayer, conferring of Texts,* &c. *Yet by their diſagreement ſhew, that ſome of them are deceived. Now they hold all the Articles of their faith, upon this only ground of Scripture, interpreted by theſe rules, and therefore it is clear, that the ground of their faith is infallible in no point at all.*

Anſ. The firſt of theſe ſuppoſitions muſt needs be true, but the ſecond is apparently falſe: I mean, that every Proteſtant is perſwaded that he hath uſed thoſe means which are preſcribed for underſtanding of Scripture. But that which you collect from theſe ſuppoſitions is clearly inconſequent: and by as good Logick you might conclude, that Logick and Geometry ſtand upon no certain grounds, that the rules of the one, and the principles of the other do ſometimes fail, becauſe the diſagreement of Logicians and Geometricians ſhew, that ſome of them are deceived.

ceived. Might not a Jew conclude as well againſt all Chriſtians, that they have no certain ground whereon to relie in their underſtanding of Scripture, becauſe their diſagreements ſhew that ſome are deceived; becauſe ſome deduce from it the infallibility of a Church, and others no ſuch matter? So likewiſe a Turk might uſe the ſame argument againſt both Jews and Chriſtians, and an Atheiſt againſt all Religions, and a Sceptick againſt all reaſon. Might not the one ſay, Mens diſagreement in Religion, ſhews that there is no certainty in any; and the other, that experience of their contradictions teacheth, that the rules of reaſon do ſometimes fail? Do not you ſee and feel how void of reaſon and how full of impiety your ſophiſtry is? And how tranſported with zeal againſt Proteſtants, you urge arguments againſt them, which if they could not be anſwered, would overthrow not only your own, but all Religion? But God be thanked, the anſwer is eaſie and obvious! For let men but remember not to impute the faults of men but only to men, and then it will eaſily appear, that there may be ſufficient certainty in reaſon, in Religion, in the rules of interpreting Scripture, though men through their faults, take not care to make uſe of them, and ſo run into divers errors and diſſentions.

48. Obj. *But Proteſtants cannot determine what points be fundamental, and therefore muſt remain uncertain, whether or no they be not in ſome fundamental error.*

Anſ. By like reaſon ſince you acknowledge, that every error in points defined and declared by your Church deſtroys the ſubſtance of Faith, and yet cannot determine what points be defined, it followeth that you muſt remain uncertain, whether or no you be not in ſome fundamental error, and ſo want the ſubſtance of Faith, without which there can be no hope of Salvation.

But though we cannot perhaps ſay in particular, thus much, and no more is fundamental, yet believing all the Bible, we are certain enough that we believe all that is fundamental. As he that in a receipt, takes twenty ingredients whereof ten only are neceſſary, though he know not which thoſe ten are, yet taking the whole twenty

he is ſure enough that he has taken all that are neceſſary.

49. Ad §. 29. Obj. *It is generally delivered by Catholick Divines that he who erreth againſt any one revealed truth, loſeth all Divine Faith. Now certainly ſome Proteſtants muſt do ſo, becauſe they hold contradictions, which cannot all be true. Therefore ſome of them at leaſt, have no divine faith.*

Anſ. I paſs by your weakneſs in urging Proteſtants with the authority of your Divines. Yet if the Authority of your Divines were even Canonical, certainly nothing could be concluded from it in this matter, there being not one of them, who delivers for true doctrin this poſition of yours, thus nakedly ſet down, *That any error againſt any one revealed truth deſtroys all divine faith.* For they all require (not your ſelf excepted) that this truth muſt not only be revealed, but revealed publickly, and (all things conſidered) ſufficiently propounded to the erring party, to be one of thoſe, which God under pain of damnation commands all men to believe.

But if the Reader will be at the pains he may ſee this vain fancy confuted, out of one of the moſt rational and profound Doctors of your own Church, I mean *Eſtius*, upon the third Book of the Sententes, the 23. Diſtinct. and the 13. Section, beginning thus. *It is diſputed whether in him who believes ſome of the Articles of our Faith, and disbelieves others, or perhaps ſome one, there be faith properly ſo called in reſpect of that which he does believe?*

50. But *if Proteſtants have certainty, they want obſcurity, and ſo have not that faith, which as the Apoſtle ſaith is of things not appearing.* This argument you proſecute in the next Paragraph; but I can find nothing in it, to convince or perſwade me that Proteſtants cannot have as much certainty as is required to faith, of an object not ſo evident as to beget ſcience. If obſcurity will not conſiſt with certainty in the higheſt degree, then you are to blame for requiring to faith contradicting conditions. If certainty and obſcurity will ſtand together, what reaſon can be imagined that a Proteſtant may not entertain them both as well as a Papiſt? Your bodies and ſouls, your underſtandings and wills

wills are, I think, of the ſame condition with ours: And why then may not we be certain of an obſcure thing as well as you?

51. But then beſides, I am to tell you, that you are here, every where, extreamly, if not affectedly miſtaken in the Doctrin of Proteſtants; who though they acknowledge, that the things which they believe are in themſelves as certain as any demonſtrable or ſenſible verities, yet pretend not that their certainty of adherence is moſt perfect and abſolute, but ſuch as may be perfected and increaſed as long as they *walk by faith and not by ſight.* And conſonant hereunto is their doctrin touching the evidence of the objects whereunto they adhere. For you abuſe the world and them, if you pretend that they hold the firſt of your two principles, That theſe particular Books are the word of God, (for ſo I think you mean) either to be in it ſelf evidently certain, or of it ſelf and being deveſted of the motives of credibility, evidently credible: For they are not ſo fond as to be ignorant, nor ſo vain as to pretend, that all men do aſſent to it, which they would if it were evidently certain, nor ſo ridiculous as to imagine, that if an *Indian* that never heard of Chriſt or Scripture, ſhould by chance find a Bible in his own Language, and were able to read it, that upon the reading it he would certainly without a miracle believe it to be the word of God: which he could not chuſe if it were evidently credible. What then do they affirm of it? Certainly no more than this, that whatſoever man that is not of a perverſe mind, ſhall weigh with ſerious and mature deliberation, thoſe great moments of reaſon which may incline him to believe the Divine authority of Scripture, and compare them with the light objections that in prudence can be made againſt it, he ſhall not chuſe but find ſufficient nay abundant inducements to yield unto it firm faith and ſincere obedience. Let that learned man *Hugo Grotius* ſpeak for all the reſt, in his Book *of the Truth of Chriſtian Religion*; which Book whoſoever attentively peruſes ſhall find that a man may have great reaſon to be a Chriſtian without dependence upon your Church for any part of it: and that your Religion.

ligion is no foundation of, but rather a ſcandal and an objection againſt Chriſtianity. He then in the laſt Chapter of his ſecond Book hath theſe excellent words, 'If 'any be not ſatisfied with theſe arguments aboveſaid, but 'deſires more forcible reaſons for confirmation of the ex'cellency of Chriſtian Religion, let ſuch know that as 'there are variety of things which be true, ſo are there di'vers ways of proving or manifeſting the truth. Thus is 'there one way in Mathematicks, another in Phyſicks, a 'third in Ethicks, and laſtly another kind when a matter 'of fact is in queſtion: wherein verily we muſt reſt con'tent with ſuch Teſtimonies as are free from all ſuſpicion 'of untruth; otherwiſe down goes all the frame and uſe 'of Hiſtory, and a great part of the art of Phyſick, toge'ther with all dutifulneſs that ought to be between parents 'and children: for matters of practice can no way elſe be 'known but by ſuch Teſtimonies. Now it is the pleaſure 'of Almighty God that thoſe things which he would have 'us to believe (ſo that the very belief thereof may be im'puted to us for obedience) ſhould not ſo evidently ap'pear, as thoſe things which are apprehended by ſenſe 'and plain demonſtration, but only be ſo far forth reveal'ed as may beget faith, and a perſwaſion thereof, in the 'hearts and minds of ſuch as are not obſtinate: That ſo 'the Goſpel may be as a touchſtone for tryal of mens 'judgments, whether they be ſound or unſound. For ſee'ing theſe arguments, whereof we have ſpoken, have in'duced ſo many honeſt, godly, and wiſe men to approve 'of this Religion, it is thereby plain enough that the fault 'of other mens infidelity is not for want of ſufficient teſti'mony, but becauſe they would not have that to be had 'and embraced for truth which is contrary to their wilful 'deſires; it being a hard matter for them to relinquiſh 'their honours, and ſet at naught other commodities; 'which thing they know they ought to do, if they admit of 'Chriſts Doctrin and obey what he hath commanded. 'And this is the rather to be noted of them, for that ma'ny other hiſtorical narrations are approved by them to be 'true, which notwithſtanding are only manifeſt by autho'rity,

'rity, and not by any ſuch ſtrong proofs, and perſwaſi-
'ons, or tokens, as do declare the hiſtory of Chriſt to be
'true; which are evident, partly by the confeſſion of
'thoſe Jews that are yet alive; and partly in thoſe compa-
'nies and congregations of Chriſtians which are any where
'to be found; whereof doubtleſs there was ſome cauſe.
'Laſtly, ſeeing the long duration or continuance of Chri-
'ſtian Religion, and the large extent thereof can be aſcri-
'bed to no human power, therefore the ſame muſt be at-
'tributed to miracles: or if any deny that it came to paſs
'through a miraculous manner; this very getting ſo great
'ſtrength and power without a miracle, may be thought to
'ſurpaſs any miracle.

52. And now you ſee I hope that Proteſtants neither do nor need to pretend to any ſuch evidence in the doctrin they believe, as cannot well conſiſt both with the eſſence and the obedience of faith. Let us come now to the laſt nullity which you impute to the faith of Proteſtants, and that it is *want of prudence*. Touching which point, as I have already demonſtrated, that wiſdom is not eſſential to faith, but that a man may truly believe truth, though upon inſufficient motives; So I doubt not but I ſhall make good, that if prudence were neceſſary to faith, we have better title to it than you; and that if a wiſer than *Solomon* were here, he ſhould have better reaſon to believe the Religion of Proteſtants than Papiſts, the Bible rather than the Council of *Trent*. But let us hear what you can ſay!

53. Ad §. 31. You demand then firſt of all, *What wiſdom was it to forſake a Church confeſſedly very ancient, and beſides which there could be demonſtrated no other Viſible Church of Chriſt upon earth?* I anſwer: Againſt God and truth there lies no preſcription, and therefore certainly it might be great wiſdom to forſake ancient Errors for more ancient Truths. One God is rather to be followed than innumerable worlds of men: And therefore it might be great wiſdom either for the whole Viſible Church, nay for all the men in the world, having wandred from the way of Truth, to return unto it; or for a part of it, nay for one man to do ſo, although all the world beſides were madly reſolute

reſolute to do the contrary. It might be great wiſdom to forſake the Errors though of the only Viſible Church, much more the *Roman*, which in conceiving her ſelf the whole Viſible Church, does ſomewhat like the Frog in the Fable, which thought the Ditch he lived in to be all the World.

54. You demand again, *What wiſdom was it to forſake a Church acknowledged to want nothing neceſſary to Salvation, indued with Succeſſion of Biſhops,* &c. uſq; ad *Election or Choice?* I anſwer: Yet might it be great wiſdom to forſake a Church not acknowledged to want nothing neceſſary to Salvation, but accuſed and convicted of many damnable errors: certainly damnable to them who were convicted of them, had they ſtill perſiſted in them after their conviction; though perhaps pardonable (which is all that is acknowledged) to ſuch as ignorantly continued in them. A Church vainly arrogating without poſſibility of proof a perpetual Succeſſion of Biſhops, holding always the ſame doctrine; and with a ridiculous impudence pretending perpetual poſſeſſion of all the world: whereas the world knows, that a little before *Luthers* ariſing, your Church was confined to a part of a part of it. Laſtly a Church vainly glorying in the dependence of other Churches upon her, which yet ſhe ſupports no more than thoſe crouching Anticks which ſeem in great buildings to labour under the weight they bear, do indeed ſupport the Fabrick. For a corrupted and falſe Church may give authority to preach the Truth, and conſequently againſt her own falſhoods and corruptions. Beſides, a falſe Church may preſerve the Scripture true, (as now the Old Teſtament is preſerved by the Jews,) either not being arrived to that height of impiety as to attempt the corruption of it, or not able to effect it, or not perceiving, or not regarding the oppoſition of it to her corruptions. And ſo we might receive from you lawful Ordination and true Scriptures, though you were a falſe Church; and receiving the Scriptures from you (though not from you alone, I hope you cannot hinder us, neither need we ask your leave to believe and obey them. And this, though you be a falſe Church,

Church; and receiving the Scriptures from you (though not from you alone,) I hope you cannot hinder us, neither need we ask your leave, to believe and obey them. And this, though you be a falſe Church, is enough to make us a true one. As for a *Succeſſion of men that held with us in all points of Doctrine*, it is a thing we need not, and you have as little as we. So that if we acknowledge that your Church before *Luther* was a true Church, it is not for any ends, for any dependence that we have upon you; but becauſe we conceive that in a charitable conſtruction, you may paſs for a true Church. Such a Church (and no better) as you do ſometimes acknowledge *Proteſtants* to be, that is, a Company of men, wherein ſome ignorant Souls may be ſaved. So that in this ballancing of Religion againſt Religion, and Church againſt Church, it ſeems you have nothing of weight and moment to put into your Scale; nothing but Smoak and Wind, vain ſhadows and phantaſtical pretences. Yet if *Proteſtants* on the other ſide, had nothing to put in their Seal but thoſe negative commendations which you are pleaſed to afford them; nothing but, no Unity, nor means to procure it; no farther extent when *Luther* aroſe than *Luthers* Body; no Univerſality of time or place; no viſibility or being, except only in your Church; no Succeſſion of Perſons or Doctrine; no leader but *Luther*, in a quarrel begun upon no ground but paſſion; no Church, no Ordination, no Scriptures but ſuch as they received from you; if all this were true, and this were all that could be pleaded for Proteſtants, poſſibly with an allowance of three grains of partiality your Scale might ſeem to turn. But then if it may appear that part of theſe objections are falſly made againſt them, the reſt vainly; that whatſoever of truth is in theſe imputations, is impertinent to this Tryal, and whatſoever is pertinent is untrue; and beſides, that plenty of good matter may be alledged for Proteſtants which is here diſſembled: then I hope, our Cauſe may be good notwithſtanding theſe pretences.

55. I ſay then, that want of Univerſality of time and place, The inviſibility or not exiſtence of the profeſſors of

Proteſtant Doctrine before *Luther*, *Luthers* being alone when he firſt oppoſed your Church, Our having our Church, Ordinations, Scriptures, perſonal and yet not Doctrinal Succeſſion from you, are vain and impertinent allegations, againſt the truth of our Doctrine and Church. That the entire truth of Chriſt without any mixture of Error ſhould be profeſſed or believed in all places at any time, or in any place at all times, is not a thing evident in reaſon, neither have we any Revelation for it. And therefore in relying ſo confidently on it, you build your Houſe upon the Sand. And what obligation we had either to be ſo peeviſh, as to take nothing of yours, or ſo fooliſh as to take all, I do not underſtand. For whereas you ſay that *this is to be chooſers and therefore Hereticks*, I tell you that though all Hereticks are chooſers, yet all chooſers are not Hereticks, otherwiſe they alſo, which chooſe your Religion muſt be Hereticks. As for *our wanting Unity and Means of proving it*, Luthers *oppoſing your Church upon meer paſſion, our following private men rather than the Catholick Church*; the firſt and laſt are meer untruths, for we want not Unity, nor means to procure it in things neceſſary. Plain places of Scripture, and ſuch as need no interpreter are our means to obtain it. Neither do we follow any private men, but only the Scripture, the Word of God as our rule, and reaſon, which is alſo the gift of God given to direct us in all our actions, in the uſe of this rule. And then for *Luthers oppoſing your Church upon meer paſſion*, it is a thing I will not deny becauſe I know not his Heart, and for the ſame reaſon you ſhould not have affirmed it. Sure I am, whether he oppoſed your Church upon reaſon or no, he had reaſon enough to oppoſe it. And therefore if he did it upon paſſion, we will follow him only in his action and not in his paſſion, in his oppoſition, not in the manner of it; and then I preſume you will have no reaſon to condemn us, unleſs you will ſay that a good action cannot be done with reaſon, becauſe ſome Body before us hath done it upon paſſion. You ſee then how imprudent you have been in the choice of your arguments,

to

to prove *Proteſtants* unwiſe in the choice of their Religion.

56. It remains now, that I ſhould ſhew that many reaſons of moment may be alledged for the juſtification of *Proteſtants*, which are diſſembled by you, and not put into the Balance. Know then, Sir, that when I ſay, the Religion of *Proteſtants*, is in prudence to be preferred before yours: as on the one ſide I do not underſtand by your Religion, the Doctrine of *Bellarmine* or *Baronius*, or any other private man amongſt you, nor the Doctrine of the *Sorbon*, or of the *Jeſuits*, or of the *Dominicans*, or of any other particular Company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profeſs to agree, *the Doctrine of the Council of Trent*: ſo accordingly on the other ſide, by the *Religion of Proteſtants*, I do not underſtand the Doctrine of *Luther* or *Calvin*, or *Melanchthon*; nor the Confeſſion of *Auguſta*, or *Geneva*, nor the Catechiſm of *Heidelburg*, nor the Articles of the Church of *England*, no nor the *Harmony* of *Proteſtant* Confeſſions; but that wherein they all agree, and which they all ſubſcribe with a greater *Harmony*, as a perfect rule of their Faith and Actions, that is, The *Bible*. The *Bible*, I ſay, The *Bible* only is the Religion of *Proteſtants*! Whatſoever elſe they believe beſides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable conſequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of Opinion; but as matter of Faith and Religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themſelves, nor require the belief of it of others, without moſt high and moſt Schiſmatical preſumption. I for my part after a long (and as I verily believe and hope,) impartial ſearch of *the true way to Eternal Happineſs*, do profeſs plainly that I cannot find any reſt for the ſole of my Foot, but upon this Rock only. I ſee plainly and with mine own eyes, that there are *Popes* againſt *Popes*, Councils againſt Councils, ſome Fathers againſt others, the ſame Fathers againſt themſelves, a Conſent of Fathers of one Age againſt a Conſent of Fathers of another Age, the Church of one Age againſt the Church of another Age. Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: No Tradition but only of

Scripture, can derive it ſelf from the Fountain, but may be plainly proved, either to have been brought in, in ſuch an Age after Chriſt; or that in ſuch an Age it was not in. In a word, there is no ſufficient certainty but of Scripture only, for any conſidering man to build upon. This therefore, and this only I have reaſon to believe: This I will profeſs, according to this I will live, and for this, if there be occaſion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly loſe my life, though I ſhould be ſorry that Chriſtians ſhould take it from me. Propoſe me any thing out of this Book, and require whether I believe it or no, and ſeem it never ſo incomprehenſible to humane reaſon, I will ſubſcribe it with Hand and Heart, as knowing no demonſtration can be ſtronger than this, God hath ſaid ſo therefore it is true. In other things I will take no mans liberty of judgment from him; neither ſhall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worſe man, nor the worſe Chriſtian: I will love no man the leſs, for differing in opinion from me. And what meaſure I mete to others I expect from them again. I am fully aſſured that God does not, and therefore that men ought not to require any more of any man than this, To believe the Scripture to be Gods word, to endeavour to find the true ſenſe of it, and to live according to it.

57. This is the Religion which I have choſen after a long deliberation, and I am verily perſuaded that I have choſen wiſely, much more wiſely than if I had guided my ſelf according to your Churches authority. For the Scripture being all true, I am ſecured by believing nothing elſe, that I ſhall believe no falſhood as matter of Faith. And if I miſtake the ſenſe of Scripture, and ſo fall into Error, yet am I ſecure from any danger thereby, if but your grounds be true: becauſe endeavouring to find the true ſenſe of Scripture, I cannot but hold my Error without pertinacy, and be ready to forſake it when a more true and a more probable ſenſe ſhall appear unto me. And then all neceſſary truth being as I have proved, plainly ſet down in Scripture, I am certain by believing Scripture, to believe all

all neceſſary Truth: And he that does ſo, if his life be anſwerable to his Faith, how is it poſſible he ſhould fail of Salvation?

58. Beſides, whatſoever may be pretended to gain to your Church the credit of a Guide, all that and much more may be ſaid for the Scripture. Hath your Church been Ancient? The Scripture is more Ancient. Is your Church a means to keep men at Unity? So is the Scripture to keep thoſe that believe it and will obey it, in Unity of belief, in matters neceſſary or very profitable, and in Unity of Charity in points unneceſſary. Is your Church Univerſal for time or place? Certainly the Scripture is more Univerſal. For all the Chriſtians in the World (thoſe I mean that in truth deſerve this name,) do now, and always have believed the Scripture to be the Word of God: whereas only you ſay that you only are the Church of God, and all Chriſtians beſides yon deny it.

59. Thirdly, following the Scripture, I follow that whereby you prove your Churches infallibility, (whereof were it not for Scripture what pretence could you have, or what notion could we have?) and by ſo doing tacitely confeſs, that your ſelves are ſurer of the Truth of the Scripture than of your Churches authority. For we muſt be ſurer of the proof than of the thing proved, otherwiſe it is no proof.

60. Fourthly, following the Scripture, I follow that which muſt be true if your Church be true: for your Church gives atteſtation to it. Whereas if I follow your Church, I muſt follow that which, though Scripture be true, may be falſe; nay which if Scripture be true muſt be falſe, becauſe the Scripture teſtifies againſt it.

61. Fifthly, to follow the Scripture I have Gods expreſs warrant and command, and no colour of any prohibition: But to believe your Church infallible, I have no command at all, much leſs an expreſs command. Nay I have reaſon to fear that I am prohibited to do ſo in theſe Words: *call no man Maſter on Earth: They fell by infidelity, Thou ſtandeſt by Faith, Be not high minded but fear: The Spirit of truth The World cannot receive.*

62. Following

62. Following your Church I muſt hold many things not only above reaſon but againſt it, if any thing be againſt it: whereas following the Scripture I ſhall believe many myſteries but no impoſſibilities; many things above reaſon, but nothing againſt it; many things which had they not been revealed, reaſon could never have diſcovered, but nothing which by true reaſon may be confuted: many things which reaſon cannot comprehend how they can be, but nothing which reaſon can comprehend that it cannot be. Nay I ſhall believe nothing which reaſon will not convince that I ought to believe it: For reaſon will convince any man, unleſs he be of a perverſe mind, that the Scripture is the Word of God: And then no reaſon can be greater than this, God ſays ſo, therefore it is true.

63. Following your Church I muſt hold many things which to any mans judgment that will give himſelf the liberty of judgment, will ſeem much more plainly contradicted by Scripture, than the infallibility of your Church appears to be confirmed by it; and conſequently muſt be ſo fooliſh as to believe your Church exempted from Error upon leſs evidence, rather than ſubject to the common condition of mankind upon greater evidence. Now if I take the Scripture only for my Guide, I ſhall not need to do any thing ſo unreaſonable.

64. If I will follow your Church I muſt believe impoſſibilities, and that with an abſolute certainty, upon motives which are confeſſed to be but only *Prudential* and probable: That is, with a weak Foundation I muſt firmly ſupport a heavy, a monſtrous heavy building: Now following the Scripture I ſhall have no neceſſity to undergo any ſuch difficulties.

65. Following your Church I muſt be ſervant of Chriſt and a Subject of the King, but only *Ad placitum Papæ.* I muſt be prepared in mind to renounce my allegiance to the King, when the *Pope* ſhall declare him an Heretick and command me not to obey him: And I muſt be prepared in mind *to eſteem Vertue Vice, and Vice Vertue, if the* Pope *ſhall ſo determine.* Indeed you ſay it is impoſſible he ſhould do the latter; but that you know is a great queſtion, neither is it fit my obedience to God and the King ſhould depend upon

upon a queſtionable Foundation. And howſoever, you muſt grant that if by an impoſſible ſuppoſition the *Popes* commands ſhould be contrary to the law of Chriſt, that they of your Religion muſt reſolve to obey rather the commands of the *Pope* than the law of Chriſt. Whereas if I follow the Scripture, I may, nay I muſt obey my Sovereign in lawful things, though an Heretick, though a Tyrant, and though, I do not ſay the *Pope*, but the Apoſtles themſelves, nay *an Angel from Heaven ſhould teach any thing againſt the Goſpel of Chriſt, I may, nay I muſt denounce Anathema to him.*

66. Following the Scripture I ſhall believe a Religion, which being contrary to Fleſh and Blood, without any aſſiſtance from worldly power, wit or policy; nay againſt all the power and policy of the World prevailed and enlarged it ſelf in a very ſhort time all the World over. Whereas it is too too apparent, that your Church hath got and ſtill maintains her authority over mens Conſciences, by counterfeiting falſe miracles, forging falſe ſtories, by obtruding on the World ſuppoſitious writings, by corrupting the monuments of former times, and defacing out of them all which any way makes againſt you, by Wars, by perſecutions, by Maſſacres, by Treaſons, by Rebellions; in ſhort, by all manner of Carnal means whether violent or fraudulent.

67. Following the Scripture I ſhall believe a Religion, the firſt Preachers of Profeſſors whereof, it is moſt certain they could have no worldly ends upon the World, that they could not project to themſelves by it any of the profits or honours or pleaſures of this World, but rather were to expect the contrary, even all the miſeries which the World could lay upon them. On the other ſide, the Head of your Church, the pretended Succeſſor of the Apoſtles, and Guide of Faith, it is even palpable, that he makes your Religion the inſtrument of his ambition, and by it ſeeks to entitle himſelf *directly or indirectly to the Monarchy of the World.* And beſides, it is evident to any man that has but half an eye, that moſt of thoſe Doctrines which you add to the Scripture do make one way or other, for the honour or temporal profit of the Teachers of them.

68. Fol-

68. Following the Scripture only, I ſhall embrace a Religion of admirable ſimplicity, conſiſting in a manner wholly in the worſhip of God in Spirit and Truth. Whereas your Church and Doctrine is even loaded with an infinity of weak, childiſh, ridiculous, unſavoury ſuperſtitions and ceremonies, and full of that *righteouſneſs* for which *Chriſt ſhall Judge the World.*

69. Following the Scripture, I ſhall believe that which Univerſal, never-failing Tradition aſſures me, that it was by the admirable ſupernatural Work of God confirmed to be the Word of God: whereas never any miracle was wrought, never ſo much as a lame Horſe cured in confirmation of your Churches authority and infallibility. And if any ſtrange things have been done, which may ſeem to give atteſtation to ſome parts of your Doctrine, yet this proves nothing but the truth of the Scripture, which foretold that (Gods providence permitting it, and the wickedneſs of the World deſerving it) *ſtrange ſigns and wonders ſhould be wrought to confirm falſe Doctrine, that they which love not the Truth, may be given over to ſtrange deluſions.* Neither does it ſeem to me any ſtrange thing, that God ſhould permit ſome true wonders to be done to delude them who have forged ſo many to deceive the World.

70. If I follow the Scripture, I muſt not promiſe my ſelf Salvation without effectual dereliction and mortification of all Vices, and the effectual Practice of all Chriſtian Vertues: But your Church opens an eaſier and a broader way to Heaven, and though I continue all my life long in a courſe of ſin, and without the Practice of any Vertue, yet gives me aſſurance that I may be let into Heaven, at a Poſtern-gate, even by any Act of Attrition at the hour of Death, if it be joyned with confeſſion, or by an Act of Contrition without confeſſion.

71. Admirable are the Precepts of piety and humility, of innocence and patience, of liberality, frugality, temperance, ſobriety, juſtice, meekneſs, fortitude, conſtancy and gravity, contempt of the World, love of God and the love of mankind; In a Word, of all Vertues, and againſt

againſt all vice, which the Scriptures impoſe upon us, to be obeyed under pain of damnation: The ſum whereof is in manner compriſed in our *Saviours Sermon upon the Mount*, recorded in the 5, 6, and 7. of S. *Matthew*, which if they were generally obeyed, could not but make the world generally happy, and the goodneſs of them alone were ſufficient to make any wiſe and good man believe that this Religion rather than any other, came from God the fountain of all goodneſs. And that they may be generally obeyed, our Saviour hath ratified them all in the cloſe of his Sermon, with theſe univerſal Sanctions, *Not every one that ſaith Lord Lord, ſhall enter into the Kingdom, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in Heaven:* and again, *whoſoever heareth theſe ſayings of mine and doth them not, ſhall be likned unto a fooliſh man which built his houſe upon the ſand, and the rain deſcended, and the flood came, and the winds blew, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof.* Now your Church, notwithſtanding all this, enervates and in a manner diſſolves and abrogates many of theſe precepts, teaching men that they are not Laws for all Chriſtians, but Counſels of perfection and matters of Supererrogation: that a man ſhall do well if he do obſerve them, but he ſhall not ſin if he obſerve them not; that they are for them who aim at high places in heaven, who aſpire with the two ſons of *Zebede*, to the right hand or to the left hand of Chriſt: But if a man will be content barely to go to heaven, and to be a doorkeeper in the houſe of God, eſpecially if he will be content to taſt of Purgatory in the way, he may obtain it at any eaſier purchaſe. Therefore the Religion of your Church is not ſo holy nor ſo good as the doctrin of Chriſt delivered in Scripture, and therefore not ſo likely to come from the Fountain of holineſs and goodneſs.

72. Laſtly, if I follow your Church for my Guide, I ſhall do all one, as if I ſhould follow a Company of blind men in a judgment of colours, or in the choice of a way. For every unconſidering man is blind in that which he does not conſider. Now what is your Church but a Company of unconſidering men, who comfort themſelves be-

cauſe they are a great company together, but all of them, either out of idleneſs refuſe the trouble of a ſevere tryal of their Religion, (as if heaven were not worth it,) or out of ſuperſtition fear the event of ſuch a tryal, that they may be ſcrupled and ſtaggered and diſquieted by it; and therefore, for the moſt part do it not all. Or if they do it, they do it negligently and hypocritically, and perfunctorily, rather for the ſatisfaction of others than themſelves: but certainly without indifference, without liberty of judgment, without a reſolution to doubt of it, if upon examination the grounds of it prove uncertain, or to leave it, if they prove apparently falſe. My own experience aſſures me, that in this imputation I do you no injury: but it is very apparent to all men from your ranking, *doubting of any part of your Doctrin*, among mortal ſins. For from hence it follows, that ſeeing every man muſt reſolve that he will never commit mortal ſin, that he muſt never examine the grounds of it at all, for fear he ſhould be moved to doubt: or if he do, he muſt reſolve that no motives, be they never ſo ſtrong ſhall move him to doubt, but that with his will and reſolution he will uphold himſelf in a firm belief of your Religion, though his reaſon and his underſtanding fail him. And ſeeing this is the condition of all thoſe whom you eſteem good Catholicks, who can deny, but you are a Company of men unwilling and afraid to underſtand, leſt you ſhould do good! That have eyes to ſee and will not ſee, that have *not the love of truth* (which is only to be known by an indifferent tryal,) and therefore deſerve *to be given over to ſtrong deluſions*; men that love darkneſs more than light: in a word, that you are *the blind leading the blind*, and what prudence there can be, in following ſuch Guides, our Saviour hath taught us in ſaying, *If the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch.*

74. Ad §. 32. Your next and laſt argument againſt the faith of Proteſtants is, becauſe *wanting certainty and prudence, it muſt alſo want the fourth condition, Supernaturality. For that being a humane perſwaſion, it is not in the eſſence of it Supernatural: and being imprudent and raſh, it cannot proceed from*

from Divine motion, and ſo is not ſupernatural in reſpect of the cauſe from which it proceedeth.

Anſ. This little diſcourſe ſtands wholly upon what went before, and therefore muſt fall together with it. I have proved the Faith of Proteſtants as certain, and as prudent as the faith of Papiſts; and therefore if theſe be certain grounds of ſupernaturality, our faith may have it as well as yours. I would here furthermore be informed how you can aſſure us that your faith is not your perſwaſion or opinion (for you make them all one,) that your Churches doctrine is true? Or if you grant it your perſwaſion, why is it not the perſwaſion of men, and in reſpect of the ſubject of it, an humane perſwaſion? I deſire alſo to know, what ſenſe there is in pretending that your perſwaſion is, not in regard of the object only and cauſe of it, but in nature or eſſence of it ſupernatural? Laſtly, whereas you ſay, that *being imprudent it cannot come from divine motion:* certainly by this reaſon all they that believe your own Religion, and cannot give a wiſe and ſufficient reaſon for it, (as millions amongſt you cannot) muſt be condemned to have no ſupernatural faith: or if not, then without queſtion nothing can hinder, but that the imprudent faith of Proteſtants may proceed from divine motion, as well as the imprudent faith of Papiſts.

75. And thus having weighed your whole diſcourſe, and found it altogether lighter than vanity, why ſhould I not invert your concluſion, and ſay, Seeing you have not proved that whoſoever errs againſt any one point of Faith loſeth all divine Faith: nor that any error whatſoever concerning that which by the Parties litigant may be eſteemed a matter of faith is a grievous ſin, it follows not at all, that when two men hold different doctrines concerning Religion, that but one can be ſaved? Not that I deny, but that the ſentence of S. *Chryſoſt.* with which you conclude this Chapter may in a good ſenſe be true: for oftimes by *the faith* is meant only that Doctrin which is *neceſſary to ſalvation,* and to ſay that ſalvation may be had without any the leaſt thing which is neceſſary to ſalvation, implies a repugnance and deſtroys it ſelf. Beſides, not to

believe all neceſſary points, and to believe none at all, is for the purpoſe of ſalvation all one; and therefore he that does ſo, may juſtly be ſaid to deſtroy the Goſpel of Chriſt, ſeeing he makes it uneffectual to the end for which it was intended, the Salvation of mens ſouls. But why you ſhould conceive that all differences about Religion are concerning matters of faith, in this high notion of the word, for that I conceive no reaſon.

CHAP. VII.

The ANSWER to the Seventh CHAPTER.

Shewing that Proteſtants are not bound by the Charity which they owe to themſelves, to reunite themſelves to the Roman *Church.*

6. Ad §. 2.] WHereas you ſay, *it is directly againſt Charity to our ſelves, to adventure the omitting of any means neceſſary to ſalvation,* this is true: But ſo is this alſo, that it is directly againſt the ſame Charity, to adventure the omitting any thing, that may any way help or conduce to my ſalvation, that may make the way to it more ſecure or leſs dangerous. And therefore if the errors of the *Roman* Church do but hinder me in this way, or any way endanger it, I am in Charity to my ſelf bound to forſake them, though they be not deſtructive of it. Again, whereas you conclude, *That if by living out of the* Roman *Church we put our ſelves in hazard to want ſomething neceſſary to Salvation, we commit a grievous ſin againſt the vertue of Charity as it reſpects our ſelves:* This conſequence may be good in thoſe which are thus perſwaded of the *Roman* Church, and yet live out of it. But the ſuppoſition is certainly falſe. We may live and die out of the *Roman* Church, without putting our ſelves in any ſuch hazard: Nay to live and die in it is as dangerous as to ſhoot a gulf, which though ſome good ignorant ſouls may do

and

and eſcape, yet it may well be feared that not one in a hundred but miſcarries.

7. *Ad* §. 5.] In this Section I obſerve, firſt, this acknowledgment of yours, *That in things neceſſary only becauſe commanded, a probable ignorance of the commandment excuſes the party from all fault, and doth not exclude Salvation.* From which Doctrin it ſeems to me to follow, that ſeeing obedience to the *Roman* Church cannot be pretended to be neceſſary, but only becauſe it is commanded, therefore not only an invincible, but even a probable ignorance of this pretended command, muſt excuſe us from all faulty breach of it, and cannot exclude Salvation. Now ſeeing this command is not pretended to be expreſly delivered, but only to be deduced from the word of God, and that not by the moſt clear and evident conſequences that may be; and ſeeing an infinity of great objections lies againſt it, which ſeem ſtrongly to prove that there is no ſuch command; with what Charity can you ſuppoſe that our ignorance of this comand, is not at the leaſt probable, if not all things conſider'd, plainly invincible? Sure I am, for my part, that I have done my true endeavour to find it true, and am ſtill willing to do ſo; but the more I ſeek, the farther I am from finding, and therefore if it be true, certainly my not finding it is very excuſable, and you have reaſon to be very charitable in your cenſures of me. 2. Whereas you ſay, That *beſides theſe things neceſſary becauſe commanded, there are other things, which are commanded becauſe neceſſary: of which number you make Divine infallible faith, Baptiſm in Act for Children, and in deſire for thoſe who are come to the uſe of Reaſon, and the Sacrament of Confeſſion, for thoſe who have committed mortal ſin:* In theſe words you ſeem to me to deliver a ſtrange Paradox, *viz.* That Faith, and Baptiſm, and Confeſſion are not therefore neceſſary for us, becauſe God appointed them, but are therefore appointed by God becauſe they were neceſſary for us, antecedently to his appointment; which if it were true, I wonder what it was beſide God that made them neceſſary, and made it neceſſary for God to command them! Beſides, in making faith one of theſe neceſſary means, you ſeem to exclude Infants from

from Salvation: For *Faith comes by hearing*, and they have not heard. In requiring that this Faith ſhould be *divine and infallible*, you caſt your *Credentes* into infinite perplexity, who cannot poſſibly by any ſure mark diſcern whether their Faith be Divine or human, or if you have any certain ſign, whereby they may diſcern, whether they believe your Churches infallibility with Divine or only with humane faith, I pray produce it, for perhaps it may ſerve us to ſhew, that our Faith is Divine as well as yours. Moreover in affirming that *Baptiſm in act is neceſſary for Infants, and for men only in deſire*, You ſeem to me in the latter to deſtroy the foundation of the former. For if a deſire of Baptiſm will ſerve men in ſtead of Baptiſm, then thoſe words of our Saviour, *Unleſs a man be born again of water*, &c. are not to be underſtood literally and rigidly of external Baptiſm; for a deſire of Baptiſm is not Baptiſm, and ſo your foundation of the abſolute neceſſity of Baptiſm is deſtroyed. And if you may gloſs the Text ſo far, as that men may be ſaved by the deſire, without Baptiſm it ſelf, becauſe they cannot have it, why ſhould you not gloſs it a little farther, that there may be ſome hope of the ſalvation of unbaptized infants: to whom it was more impoſſible to have a deſire of Baptiſm, than for the former to have the thing it ſelf? Laſtly, for your *Sacrament of Confeſſion*, we know none ſuch, nor any ſuch abſolute neceſſity of it. They that confeſs their ſins and forſake them ſhall find mercy, though they confeſs them to God only and not to men. They that confeſs them both to God and men, if they do not effectually and in time forſake them, ſhall not find mercy. 3. Whereas you ſay, that *ſuppoſing theſe means once appointed as abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, there cannot but ariſe an obligation of procuring to have them*, you muſt ſuppoſe I hope, that we know them to be ſo appointed, and that it is in our power to procure them: otherwiſe though it may be our ill fortune to fail of the end, for want of the means, certainly we cannot be obliged to procure them. For the rule of the law is alſo the dictate of common reaſon and equity, That *no man can be obliged to what is impoſſible*. We can be obliged to nothing but by

by vertue of ſome command: now it is impoſſible that God ſhould command in earneſt any thing which he knows to be impoſſible. For to command in earneſt, is to command with an intent to be obeyed; which is not poſſible he ſhould do, when he knows the thing commanded to be impoſſible. Laſtly, whoſoever is obliged to do any thing, and does it not, commits a fault; but Infants commit no fault in not procuring to have Baptiſm, therefore no obligation lies upon them to procure it. 4. Whereas you ſay, that *if Proteſtants diſſent from you in the point of the neceſſity of Baptiſm for Infants, it cannot be denied but that our diſagreement is in a point fundamental*; If you mean a point eſteemed ſo by you, this indeed cannot be denied: But if you mean a point that indeed is fundamental, this may certainly be denied, for I deny it, and ſay, that it doth not appear to me any way neceſſary to Salvation to hold the truth, or not to hold an error, touching the condition of theſe Infants. This is certain, and we muſt believe that God will not deal unjuſtly with them, but how in particular he will deal with them concerns not us, and therefore we need not much regard it. 5. Whereas you ſay the like of your *Sacrament of Pennance*, you only ſay ſo, but your proofs are wanting. Laſtly, whereas you ſay, *This rigour ought not to ſeem ſtrange or unjuſt in God, but that we are rather to bleſs him for ordaining us to Salvation by any means*: I anſwer, that it is true, we are not to queſtion the known will of God of injuſtice; yet whether that which you pretend to be Gods will, be ſo indeed, or only your preſumption, this I hope may be queſtioned lawfully and without preſumption; and if we have occaſion we may ſafely put you in mind of *Ezekiel's* commination, againſt all thoſe who ſay, *thus ſaith the Lord*, when they have no certain warrant or authority from him to do ſo.

8. *Ad* §. 4. In the fourth Paragraph you deliver this falſe and wicked Doctrin, *that for the procuring our own ſalvation we are always bound under pain of mortal ſin, to take the ſafeſt way, but for avoiding ſin we are not bound to do ſo, but may follow the opinion of any probable Doctors*, though the contrary may be certainly free from ſin, and theirs be doubt-

doubtful. Which doctrin in the former part of it is apparently falſe: For though wiſdom and Charity to our ſelves would perſwade us always to do ſo, yet many times, that way which to our ſelves and our ſalvation is more full of hazard, is notwithſtanding not only lawful, but more Charitable and more noble. For example, to flie from a perſecution and ſo to avoid the temptation of it, may be the ſafer way for a mans own ſalvation; yet I preſume no man ought to condemn him of impiety, who ſhould reſolve not to uſe his liberty in this matter; but for Gods greater glory, the greater honour of truth, and the greater confirmation of his brethren in the faith, chooſe to ſtand out the ſtorm and endure the fiery tryal, rather than avoid it; rather to put his own ſoul to the hazard of a temptation, in hope of Gods aſſiſtance to go through with it, than to baulk the opportunity of doing God and his brethren ſo great a ſervice. This part therefore of this Doctrin is manifeſtly untrue. The other not only falſe but impious; for therein you plainly give us to underſtand, that in your judgment, a reſolution to avoid ſin, to the uttermoſt of our power, is no neceſſary means of Salvation, nay that a man may reſolve not to do ſo, without any danger of damnation. Therein you teach us, that we are to do more for the love of our ſelves, and our own happineſs than for the love of God; and in ſo doing contradict our Saviour, who expreſſly commands us, *to love the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our ſoul, and with all our ſtrength*; and hath taught us *that the love of God conſiſts in avoiding ſin and keeping his commandments*. Therein you directly croſs S. *Pauls* Doctrin, who though he were a very probable Doctor, and had delivered his judgment for the *lawfulneſs of eating meats offered to Idols*; yet he aſſures us that he which ſhould make ſcruple of doing ſo, and forbear upon his ſcruple, ſhould not ſin, but only be *a weak brother*; whereas he, who ſhould do it with a doubtful conſcience, (though the action were by S. *Paul* warranted lawful, yet) *ſhould ſin and be condemned for ſo doing*. You pretend indeed to be rigid defenders and ſtout champions for the neceſſity of good

good works; but the truth is, *you ſpeak lies in Hypocriſie*, and when the matter is well examined, will appear to make your ſelves and your own functions neceſſary, but obedience to God unneceſſary: Which will appear to any man who conſiders what ſtrict neceſſity the Scripture impoſes upon all men, of effectual mortification of the habits of all Vices, and effectual Converſion to newneſs of Life, and Univerſal obedience, and withal remembers that an act of Attrition, which you ſay with Prieſtly abſolution is ſufficient to Salvation, is not mortification, which being a work of difficulty and time, cannot be performed in an inſtant. But for the preſent, it appears ſufficiently out of this impious aſſertion, which makes it abſolutely neceſſary for men, either in Act if it be poſſible, or if not, in Deſire, to be Baptized and Abſolved by you, and that with Intention: and in the mean time warrants them that for avoiding of ſin, they may ſafely follow the uncertain guidance of a vain man, who you cannot deny may either be deceived himſelf, or out of malice deceive them, and neglect the certain direction of God himſelf, and their own Conſciences. What wicked uſe is made of this Doctrine, your own long experience can better inform you, than it is poſſible for me to do: yet my own little converſation with you affords me one memorable example to this purpoſe. For upon this ground I knew a young Scholar in *Doway*, licenſed by a great Caſuiſt to ſwear a thing as upon his certain knowledge, whereof he had yet no knowledge but only a great preſumption, *becauſe* (forſooth) *it was the opinion of one Doctor that he might do ſo.* And upon the ſame ground, whenſoever you ſhall come to have a prevailing party in this Kingdom, and power ſufficient to reſtore your Religion, you may do it by depoſing or killing the King, by blowing up of Parliaments, and by rooting out all others of a different Faith from you. Nay this you may do, though in your own opinion it be unlawful, becauſe [a] *Bellarmine*, a

[a] *Bellar. Contr. Barcl. c. 7. In 7. c. refutare conatur Barcl. verba illa Romuli. Veteres illos Imperatores Conſtantium Valentem & Cæteros non ideo tolleravit Eccleſia quod legitimè ſucceſſiſſent, ſed quod illos ſine populi detrimento coercere non poterat. Et miratur hoc idem ſcripſiſſe Bellarminum. l. 5. de Pontif. c. 7. Sed ut magis miretur, ſciat hoc idem ſenſiſſe S. Thomam. 2. 2. q. 12. art. 2. ad 1. Ubi dicit Eccleſiam toleraſſe ut fideles obedirent Juliano Apoſtatæ, quia in ſui novitate non-dum habebant vires compeſcendi Principes terrenos. Et poſtea, Sanctus Gregorius dicit, nullum adverſus Juliani perſecutionem fuiſſe remedium præter lacrymas, quoniam non habebat Eccleſia vires quibus illus tyrannidi reſiſtere poſſet.*

man with you of approved Vertue, Learning and Judgment, hath declared his opinion for the lawfulneſs of it, in ſaying, that *want of power to maintain a Rebellion, was the only reaſon that the Primitive Chriſtians did not Rebel againſt the perſecuting Emperors.* By the ſame rule, ſeeing the Prieſts and Scribes and Phariſees, men of greateſt repute among the *Jews* for Vertue, Learning and Wiſdom, held it a lawful and a pious work to perſecute Chriſt and his Apoſtles, it was lawful for the People to follow their Leaders: for herein, according to your Doctrine, they proceeded prudently, and according to the conduct of opinion, maturely weighed and approved by men as it ſeemed to them of Vertue, Learning and Wiſdom; nay by ſuch as ſate in *Moſes* Chair, and of whom it was ſaid, *whatſoever they bid you obſerve, that obſerve and do*: which Univerſal you pretend is to be underſtood Univerſally, and without any reſtriction or limitation. And as lawful was it for the *Pagans* to perſecute the Primitive Chriſtians, becauſe *Trajan* and *Pliny*, men of great Vertue and Wiſdom were of this opinion. Laſtly, that moſt impious and deteſtable Doctrine, (which by a foul calumny you impute to me, who abhor and deteſt it,) that *men may be ſaved in any Religion*, follows from this ground unavoidably. For certainly Religion is one of thoſe things which is neceſſary only becauſe it is commanded: for if none were commanded under pain of damnation, how could it be damnable to be of any? Neither can it be damnable to be of a falſe Religion, unleſs it be a ſin to be ſo. For neither are men ſaved by good luck, but only by obedience; neither are they damned for their ill Fortune but for ſin and diſobedience. Death is the wages of nothing but ſin: and S. *James* ſure intended to deliver the adequate cauſe of ſin and Death in thoſe words, *Luſt when it hath conceived bringeth forth ſin, and ſin when it is finiſhed bringeth forth Death.* Seeing therefore in ſuch things, according to your Doctrine, it is ſufficient for avoiding of ſin, that we proceed prudently, and by the conduct of ſome probable opinion, maturely weighed and approved by men of Learning,

Learning, Vertue and Wiſdom: and ſeeing neither *Jews* want their *Gamaliels*, nor *Pagans* their *Antoninus's* nor any Sect of Chriſtians ſuch profeſſors and maintainers of their ſeveral Sects, as are eſteemed by the People, which know no better (and that very reaſonably) men of Vertue, Learning, and Wiſdom, it follows evidently that the embracing their Religion proceeds upon ſuch reaſon as may warrant their action to be prudent, and this is ſufficient for avoiding of ſin, and therefore certainly for avoiding damnation, for that in humane affairs, & diſcourſe, evidence and certainty cannot be always expected. I have ſtood the longer upon the refutation of this Doctrine, not only becauſe it is impious, and becauſe bad uſe is made of it, and worſe may be, but only becauſe the contrary poſition, *That men are bound for avoiding ſin always to take the ſafeſt way*, is a fair and ſure Foundation, for a clear confutation of the main concluſion, which in this Chapter you labour in vain to prove, and a certain proof that in regard of the precept of Charity towards ones ſelf, and of obedience to God, *Papiſts* (unleſs ignorance excuſe them) are in ſtate of ſin as long as they remain in ſubjection to the *Roman* Church.

9. for if the ſafer way for avoiding ſin, be alſo the ſafer way for avoiding damnation, then certainly the way of *Proteſtants* muſt be more ſecure, and the *Roman* way more dangerous; take but into your conſideration theſe enſuing Controverſies: Whether it be lawful to worſhip Pictures? to Picture the Trinity? to invocate Saints and Angels? to deny Lay-men the Cup in the Sacrament? to adore the Sacraments? to prohibit certain Orders of Men and Women to Marry? to Celebrate the publick ſervice of God in a language which the aſſiſtants generally underſtand not? and you will not chooſe but confeſs that in all theſe you are on the more dangerous ſide for the committing of ſin, and we on that which is more ſecure. For in all theſe things, if we ſay true, you do that which is impious: on the other ſide if you were in the right, yet we might be ſecure enough, for we ſhould only not do ſomething which you confeſs not neceſſary to be done.

We pretend, and are ready to juſtifie out of principles agreed upon between us, that in all theſe things, you violate the manifeſt commandments of God; and alledge ſuch Texts of Scripture againſt you, as, if you would weigh them with any indifference, would put the matter out of queſtion, but certainly you cannot with any modeſty deny, but that at leaſt they make it queſtionable. On the other ſide, you cannot with any face pretend, and if you ſhould, know not how to go about to prove, that there is any neceſſity of doing any of theſe things; that it is unlawful not to worſhip Pictures, not to Picture the Trinity, not to invocate Saints and Angels, not to give all men the entire Sacrament, not to adore the Euchariſt, not to prohibit Marriage, not to Celebrate Divine Service in an unknown Tongue: I ſay you neither do nor can pretend that there is any law of God which enjoyns us, no nor ſo much as an Evangelical Council that adviſes us to do any of theſe things. Now *where no law is there can be no ſin, for ſin is the tranſgreſſion of the Law*; It remains therefore that our forbearing to do theſe things, muſt be free from all danger and ſuſpicion of ſin; whereas your acting of them, muſt be, if not certainly impious, without all contradiction queſtionable and dangerous. I conclude therefore that which was to be concluded, that if the ſafer way for avoiding ſin, be alſo (as moſt certainly it is,) the ſafer way for avoiding damnation, then certainly the way of *Proteſtants* muſt be more ſafe, and the *Roman* way more dangerous.

12. Ad §. 5.] Here you begin to make ſome ſhew of arguing; and the firſt Argument put into form ſtands thus, *Every leaſt Error in Faith deſtroys the nature of Faith*; *It is certain that ſome* Proteſtants *do Err, and therefore they want the ſubſtance of Faith.* The Major of which Syllogiſm I have formerly confuted by unanſwerable Arguments out of one of your own beſt Authors, who ſhews plainly that he hath amongſt you, as ſtrange as you make it, many other Abettors. Beſides, if it were true, it would conclude that either you or the *Dominicans* have no Faith, in as much as you oppoſe one another as much as *Arminians* and *Calviniſts*.

13. The

13. The Second Argument ſtands thus, *Since all* Proteſtants *pretend the like certainty, it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all:* Which Argument if it were good, then what can hinder but this muſt alſo be ſo, Since *Proteſtants* and *Papiſts* pretend the like certainty; it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all! And this too: Since all Chriſtians pretend the like certainty, it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all! And thirdly this: Since men of all Religions pretend a like certainty, it is clear that none of them have any at all! And laſtly this: Since oft-times they which are abuſed with a ſpecious Paralogiſm, pretend the like certainty with them which demonſtrate, it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all! Certainly Sir, Zeal and the Devil did ſtrangely blind you, if you did not ſee that theſe horrid impieties were the immediate conſequences of your poſitions, if you did ſee it, and yet would ſet them down, you deſerve worſe cenſure. Yet ſuch as theſe, are all the Arguments wherewith you conceive your ſelf to have proved undoubtedly, that *Proteſtants have reaſon at leaſt to doubt in what caſe they ſtand.*

14. Your third and fourth Argument may be thus put into one; *Proteſtants cannot tell what points in particular be Fundamental; therefore they cannot tell whether they or their Brethren do not Err Fundamentally, and whether their difference be not Fundamental.* Both which deductions I have formerly ſhewed to be moſt inconſequent; for knowing the Scripture to contain all Fundamentals, (though many more points beſides, which makes it difficult to ſay preciſely what is Fundamental and what not,) knowing this I ſay and believing it, what can hinder but that I may be well aſſured, that I believe all Fundamentals, and that all who believe the Scripture ſincerely as well as I, do not differ from me in any thing Fundamental?

15. In the cloſe of this Section, you ſay, that *you omit to add that we want the Sacrament of Repentance inſtituted for the remiſſion of ſins, or at leaſt we muſt confeſs that we hold it not neceſſary: and yet our own Brethren the Century writers acknowledge that in the times of* Cyprian *and*

and Tertullian, *private Confeſſion even of thoughts was uſed, and that it was then commanded and thought neceſſary; and then our Ordination,* you ſay, *is very doubtful and all that depends upon it.* Anſwer, I alſo omit to anſwer, 1. That your Brother *Rhenanus,* acknowledges the contrary, and aſſures us that the Confeſſion then required and in uſe, was publick, and before the Church, and that your auricular Confeſſion was not then in the World; for which his Mouth is ſtopped by your *Index Expurgatorius.* 2. That your Brother *Arcudius* acknowledges, that the Euchariſt was in *Cyprians* time given to Infants, and eſteemed neceſſary, or at leaſt profitable for them, and the giving it ſhews no leſs; and now I would know whether you will acknowledg your Church bound to give it, and to eſteem ſo of it? 3. That it might be then commanded, and being commanded be thought neceſſary, and yet be but a Church Conſtitution. Neither will I deny, if the preſent Church could, and would ſo order it, that the abuſes of it might be prevented, and conceiving it profitable, ſhould enjoyn the uſe of it, but that being commanded it would be neceſſary. 4. Concerning our Ordinations, beſides that I have proved it impoſſible that they ſhould be ſo doubtful as yours, according to your own principles; I anſwer, that experience ſhews them certainly ſufficient to bring men to Faith and Repentance, and conſequently to Salvation; and that if there were any ſecret defect of any thing neceſſary, which we cannot help, God will certainly ſupply it.

19. It is remarkable againſt what you ſay, §. 7. *That any ſmall Error in Faith deſtroys all Faith,* that S. *Auſtin,* whoſe authority is here ſtood upon, thought otherwiſe: He conceived the *Donatiſts* to hold ſome Error in Faith and yet not to have no Faith. His words of them to this purpoſe are moſt pregnant and evident, *you are with us* (ſaith he to the *Donatiſt.* Ep. 48.) *in Baptiſm, in the Creed, in the other Sacraments:* And again. *Super geſtis cum emerit: Thou haſt proved to me that thou haſt Faith; prove to me likewiſe that thou haſt Charity.* Parallel to which words are theſe of *Optatus, Amongſt us and you is one Eccleſiaſtical con-*

Lib. 5. prope initium.

verſation,

verſation, common leſſons, the ſame Faith, the ſame Sacraments. Where by the way we may obſerve, that in the judgments of theſe Fathers, even the *Donatiſts*, though Heretieks and Schiſmaticks, gave true Ordination, the true Sacrament of Matrimony, true Sacramental Abſolution, Confirmation, the true Sacrament of the Euchariſt, true extream Unction; or elſe (chooſe you whether) ſome of theſe were not then eſteemed Sacraments. But for Ordination, whether he held it a Sacrament or no, certainly he held that it remained with them entire: for ſo he ſays in expreſs terms, in his Book againſt *Parmenianus* his Epiſtle. Which Doctrine if you can reconcile with the preſent Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, *Eris mihi magnus Apollo.*

20. Ad §. 8.] *Obj.* You ſay there is *an inevitable neceſſity for us, either to grant Salvation to your Church, or to entail certain damnation upon our own, becauſe ours can have no being till* Luther, *unleſs yours be ſuppoſed to have been the true Church.* I anſwer, this cauſe is no cauſe: For firſt, as *Luther* had no being before *Luther*, and yet he was when he was, though he was not before; ſo there is no repugnance in the terms, but that there might be a true Church after *Luther*, though there were none for ſome Ages before; as ſince *Columbus* his time, there have been Chriſtians in *America*, though before there were none for many Ages. For neither do you ſhew, neither does it appear, that the generation of Churches is Univocal, that nothing but a Church can poſſibly beget a Church: nor that the preſent being of a true Church, depends neceſſarily upon the perpetuity of a Church in all Ages; any more than the preſent being of Peripateticks or Stoicks depends upon a perpetual pedigree of them. For though I at no hand deny the Churches perpetuity, yet I ſee nothing in your Book to make me underſtand, that the truth of the preſent depends upon it, nor any thing that can hinder, but that a falſe Church, (Gods providence overwatching and over-ruling it,) may preſerve the means of confuting their own Hereſies, and reducing men to truth, and ſo raiſing a true Church, I mean the integrity and

and the Authority of the word of God with men. Thus the *Jews* preſerve means to make men Chriſtians, and *Papiſts* preſerve means to make men *Proteſtants*, and *Proteſtants* (which you ſay are a falſe Church) do, as you pretend, preſerve means to make men *Papiſts*; that is, their own Bibles, out of which you pretend to be able to prove that they are to be *Papiſts*. Secondly, you ſhew not, nor does it appear that the perpetuity of *the Church* depends on the truth of *yours*. For though you talk vainly, as if you were the only men in the World before *Luther*, yet the World knows that this is but talk, and that there were other Chriſtians beſides you, which might have perpetuated the Church though you had not been. Laſtly, you ſhew not, neither doth it appear, that your being acknowledged in ſome ſenſe a true Church, doth neceſſarily import, that we muſt grant Salvation to it, unleſs by it you underſtand the ignorant members of it, which is a very unuſual *Synechdoche*.

21. Whereas you ſay, *that Catholicks never granted that the* Donatiſts *had a true Church or might be ſaved.* I anſw. S. *Auſtin* himſelf granted that thoſe among them, who ſought the Truth, being *ready when they found it to correct their Error were not Hereticks, and therefore notwithſtanding their Error might be ſaved.* And this is all the Charity that *Proteſtants* allow to *Papiſts*.

Therefore the Argument of the *Donatiſts*, is as good as that of the *Papiſts* againſt *Proteſtants*. For the *Donatiſts* argued thus, ſpeaking to the *Catholicks, Your ſelves confeſs our Baptiſm, Sacraments and Faith good and available. We deny yours to be ſo, and ſay there is no Church, no Salvation amongſt you; Therefore it is ſafeſt for all to joyn with us.*

22. S. *Auſtins* words are (cont. lit. petil. l. 2. c. 108.) *Petilianus dixit, venite ad Eccleſiam populi & aufugite Traditores, ſi perire non vultis:* Petilian *ſaith, come to the Church ye People, and fly from the Traditours, if ye will not be damned; for that ye may know that they being guilty, eſteem well of our Faith, behold I Baptize theſe whom they have infected, but they receive thoſe whom we have Baptized.* Where

Cont. lit. Petil. l. 2. c. 108.

it

it is plain, that *Petilian* by his words makes the *Donatiſts* the Church, and excludes the *Catholicks* from ſalvation abſolutely. And whereas you ſay, *the* Catholicks *never yielded that among the* Donatiſts *there was a true Church and hope of Salvation*, I ſay it appears by what I have alledged out of S. *Auſtin*, that they yielded both theſe were among the *Donatiſts*, as much as we yield them to be among the *Papiſts*. As for D. *Potters* acknowledgment, *that they maintained an error in the matter and nature of it Heretical*: This proves them but material Hereticks, whom you do not exclude from poſſibility of Salvation. So that all things conſidered, this argument muſt be much more forcible from the *Donatiſts* againſt the *Catholicks*, than from *Papiſts* againſt *Proteſtants*, in regard *Proteſtants* grant *Papiſts* no more hope of ſalvation than *Papiſts* grant *Proteſtants*: whereas the *Donatiſts* excluded abſolutely all but their own part from hope of Salvation, ſo far as to account them no Chriſtians that were not of it: the Catholicks mean while accounting them Brethren, and freeing thoſe among them, from the imputation of Hereſie, who being in error *quærebant cautâ ſollicitudine veritatem corrigi parati cùm invenerint*; *ſought for truth carefully, being ready when they found it to correct their errors.*

23. Whereas you ſay, *That the Argument for the certainty of their Baptiſm (becauſe it was confeſſed good by Catholicks, whereas the Baptiſm of Catholicks was not confeſſed by them to be good,) is not ſo good as yours, touching the certainty of your Salvation grounded on the confeſſion of Proteſtants, becauſe we confeſs there is no damnable error in the doctrin or practice of the* Roman *Church*: I Anſwer, no: we confeſs no ſuch matter, and though you ſay ſo a hundred times, no repetition will make it true. We profeſs plainly, that many damnable errors plainly repugnant to the precepts of Chriſt both Ceremonial and Moral, more plainly than this of Rebaptization, and therefore more damnable, are believed and profeſſed by you. And therefore ſeeing this is the only diſparity you can deviſe, and this is vaniſhed, it remains that as good an anſwer as the Catholicks made touching the certainty of their Baptiſm, as good may we

make, and with much more evidence of Reaſon, touching the ſecurity and certainty of our Salvation.

24. By the way I deſire to be informed, ſeeing you affirm that *Rebaptizing thoſe whom Heretieks had baptized was a ſacriledge, and a profeſſion of a damnable Hereſie,* when it began to be ſo? If from the beginning it were ſo, then was *Cyprian* a ſacrilegious profeſſor of a damnable hereſie, and yet a Saint and a Martyr. If it were not ſo, then did your Church excommunicate *Firmilian* and others, and ſeparate from them without ſufficient ground of Excommunication or Separation, which is Schiſmatical. You ſee what difficulties you run into on both ſides; chooſe whether you will, but certainly both can hardly be avoided.

27. What S. *Auſtin* anſwers to the *Donatiſts* argument, fits us in anſwer to yours, as if it had been made for it; for as S. *Auſtin* ſays, *that Catholicks approve the Doctrin of* Donatiſts, *but abhor their Hereſie of Re-baptization:* So we ſay, that we approve thoſe fundamental and ſimple neceſſary Truths which you retain, by which ſome good ſouls among you may be ſaved, but abhor your many Superſtitions and Hereſies. And as he ſays, that as gold is good, yet ought not to be ſought for among a company of thieves, and Baptiſm good but not to be ſought for in the Conventicles of *Donatiſts:* ſo ſay we, that the Truths you retain are good, and as we hope ſufficient to bring good ignorant ſouls among you to ſalvation, yet are not to be ſought for in the Conventicle of *Papiſts,* who hold with them a mixture of many vanities, and many impieties.

30. Obj. *But* Proteſtants *do either exclude Hope by Deſpair, with the Doctrin that our Saviour died not for all, and that ſuch want grace ſufficient to ſalvation; or elſe by vain* preſumption *grounded upon a fantaſtical perſwaſion that they are predeſtinate, which Faith muſt exclude all fear and trembling;* and you add, *though ſome* Proteſtants *may relent from the rigour of the aforeſaid doctrin, yet none of them can have true hope while they hope to be ſaved in the Communion of thoſe, who defend ſuch Doctrins.*

Anſ.

Anſ. * All this may be as forcibly returned upon Papiſts, as it is urged againſt Proteſtants; in as much as all Papiſts either hold the Doctrine of Predetermination and abſolute Election, or Communicate with thoſe that do hold it. Now from this Doctrin what is more prone and obvious, than for every natural man (without Gods eſpecial preventing grace) to make this practical collection; either I am elected, or not elected; if I be, no impiety poſſible can ever damn me: If not, no poſſible induſtry can ever ſave me? Now whether this disjunctive perſwaſion be not as likely (as any doctrin of Proteſtants) to extinguiſh Chriſtian Hope and filial fear, and to lead ſome men to deſpair, others to preſumption, all to a wretchleſs and impious life, I deſire you ingenuouſly to inform me; and if you deny it, aſſure your ſelf, you ſhall be contradicted and confuted, by men of your own Religion and your own ſociety; and taught at length this charitable doctrin, that though mens opinions may be charged with the abſurd conſequences which naturally flow from them, yet the men themſelves are not; I mean, if they perceive not the conſequence of theſe abſurdities, nor do not own and acknowledge, but diſclaim and deteſt them.

* *See numb.* 4. *in the* fol. edit.

I add 1. That there is no *Calviniſt* that will deny the truth of this propoſition, *Chriſt died for all*, nor to ſubſcribe to that ſenſe of it, which your Dominicans put upon it; neither can you with coherence to the received Doctrine of your own Society, deny that they as well as the *Calviniſts*, take away the diſtinction of ſufficient and effectual grace, and indeed hold none to be ſufficient, but only that which is effectual. 2. Whereas you ſay, *They cannot make their calling certain by good works, who do certainly believe that before any good works they are juſtified, and juſtified by faith alone, and by that faith whereby they certainly believe they are juſtified:* I anſwer, There is no *Proteſtant* but believes that Faith, Repentance, and univerſal Obedience, are neceſſary to the obtaining of Gods favour and eternal happineſs. This being granted, the reſt is but a ſpeculative Controverſie, a Queſtion about words which would quickly vaniſh, but that men affect not to under-

ſtand one another. As if a company of Phyſicians were in conſultation, and ſhould all agree, that three Medicins and no more were neceſſary for the recovery of the Patients health, this were ſufficient for his direction towards the recovery of his health; though concerning the proper and ſpecifical effects of theſe three Medicins, there ſhould be amongſt them as many differences as men: So likewiſe being generally at accord that theſe three things, Faith, Hope, and Charity, are neceſſary to ſalvation, ſo that whoſoever wants any of them cannot obtain it, and he which hath them all cannot fail of it, is it not very evident that they are ſufficiently agreed for mens directions to eternal Salvation? And ſeeing Charity is a full comprehenſion of all good works, they requiring Charity as a neceſſary qualification in him that will be ſaved, what ſenſe is there in ſaying, *they cannot make their calling certain by good works?* They know what ſalvation is as well as you, and you have as much reaſon to deſire it: They believe it as heartily as you, that there is no good work but ſhall have its proper reward, and that there is no poſſibility of obtaining the eternal reward without good works: and why then may not this Doctrin be a ſufficient incitement and provocation unto good works?

31. You ſay, that *they certainly believe that before any good works they are juſtified:* But this is a calumny. There is no *Proteſtant* but requires to Juſtification, Remiſſion of ſins, and to Remiſſion of ſins they all require Repentance, and Repentance I preſume may not be denied the name of a good work, being indeed, if it be rightly underſtood, and according to the ſenſe of the word in Scripture, an effectual converſion from all ſin to all holineſs. But though it be taken for meer ſorrow for ſins paſt, and a bare purpoſe of amendment, yet even this is a good work, and therefore Proteſtants requiring this to Remiſſion of ſins, and Remiſſion of ſins to juſtification, cannot with candor be pretended to believe, that they are juſtified before any good work.

32. Obj. You ſay, *They believe themſelves juſtified by faith alone, and that by that faith whereby they believe themſelves juſtified:* *Anſ.*

Anſw. Some peradventure do ſo, but withal they believe that that faith which is alone, and unaccompanied with *ſincere* and univerſal obedience, is to be eſteemed not faith but preſumption, and is at no hand ſufficient to juſtification: that though Charity be not imputed unto juſtification, yet it is required as a neceſſary diſpoſition in the perſon to be juſtified, and that though in regard of the imperfection of it, no man can be juſtified by it, yet that on the other ſide, no man can be juſtified without it. So that upon the whole matter, a man may truly and ſafely ſay, that the Doctrin of theſe Proteſtants taken altogether, is not a Doctrin of Liberty, not a Doctrin that turns hope into preſumption, and carnal ſecurity, though it may juſtly be feared, that many licentious perſons, taking it by halves, have made this wicked uſe of it. For my part, I do heartily wiſh, that by publick Authority it were ſo ordered, that no man ſhould ever Preach or Print this Doctrin that Faith alone juſtifies, unleſs he joyns this together with it, that univerſal obedience is neceſſary to ſalvation. And beſides that thoſe Chapters of S. *Paul* which intreat of juſtification by faith, without the works of the Law, were never read in the Church, but when the thirteenth Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* concerning the abſolute neceſſity of Charity ſhould be, to prevent miſpriſion, read together with them.

33. Obj. Whereas you ſay, that *ſome Proteſtants do expreſly affirm the former point to be the ſoul of the Church,* &c. *and that therefore they muſt want the Theological vertue of Hope, and that none can have true hope, while they hope to be ſaved in their Communion.*

I *Anſwer,* They have great reaſon to believe the Doctrin of Juſtification by faith only, a point of great weight and importance, if it be rightly underſtood: that is, they have reaſon to eſteem it a principal and neceſſary duty of a Chriſtian, to place his hope of juſtification and ſalvation, not in the perfection of his own righteouſneſs (which if it be imperfect will not juſtifie,) but only in the mercies of God through Chriſts ſatisfaction: and yet notwithſtanding this, nay the rather for this, may preſerve themſelves

ſelves in the right temper of good Chriſtians, which is a happy mixture and ſweet compoſition of confidence and fear. If this Doctrin be otherwiſe expounded than I have here expounded, I will not undertake the juſtification of it, only I will ſay (that which I may do truly) that I never knew any Proteſtant ſuch a ſoli-fidian, but that he did believe theſe divine Truths; *That he muſt make his calling certain by good works: That he muſt work out his ſalvation with fear and trembling, and that while he does not ſo, he can have no well-grounded hope of Salvation*: I ſay I never met with any who did not believe theſe divine Truths, and that with a more firm, and a more unſhaken aſſent, than he does that himſelf is predeſtinate, and that he is juſtified by believing himſelf juſtified. I never met with any ſuch, who if he ſaw there were a neceſſity to do either, would not rather forgo his belief of theſe Doctrins than the former: theſe which he ſees diſputed and contradicted and oppoſed with a great multitude of very potent Arguments; then thoſe, which being the expreſs words of Scripture, whoſoever ſhould call into queſtion, could not with any modeſty pretend to the title of Chriſtian. And therefore there is no reaſon but we may believe, that their full aſſurance of the former Doctrins doth very well qualifie their perſwaſion of the latter, and that the former (as alſo the lives of many of them do ſufficiently teſtifie) are more effectual to temper their hope, and to keep it at a ſtay of a filial and modeſt aſſurance of Gods favor, built upon the conſcience of his love and fear, than the latter can be to ſwell and puff them up into vain confidence and ungrounded preſumption. This reaſon, joyned with our experience of the honeſt and religious converſation of many men of this opinion, is a ſufficient ground for Charity, to hope well of their hope: and to aſſure our ſelves that it cannot be offenſive, but rather moſt acceptable to God, if notwithſtanding this diverſity of opinion, we embrace each ether with the ſtrict embraces of love and Communion. To you and your Church we leave it, to ſeparate Chriſtians from the Church, and to preſcribe them from heaven upon trivial and trifling cauſes: As for

our

our ſelves, we conceive a charitable judgment of our Brethren and their errors, though untrue, much more pleaſing to God than a true judgment, if it be uncharitable; and therefore ſhall always chuſe (if we do err) to err on the milder and more merciful part, and rather to retain thoſe in our Communion which deſerve to be ejected, than eject thoſe that deſerve to be retained.

34. Laſtly, whereas you ſay, that *ſeeing Proteſtants differ about the point of Juſtification, you muſt needs infer that they want unity in faith, and conſequently all faith, and then that they cannot agree what points are fundamental:* I Anſwer, to the firſt of theſe inferences, that as well might you infer it upon *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome* and *Policrates*; upon *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome* and S. *Cyprian*: inaſmuch as it is undeniably evident, that what one of thoſe eſteemed neceſſary to ſalvation the other eſteemed not ſo. But points of Doctrin (as all other things) are as they are, and not as they are eſteemed: neither can a neceſſary point be made unneceſſary by being ſo accounted, nor an unneceſſary point be made neceſſary by being overvalued. But as the ancient Philoſophers, (whoſe different opinions about the ſoul of man you may read in *Ariſtotle de Anima*, and *Cicero's Tuſculan Queſtions*,) notwithſtanding their divers opinions touching the nature of the ſoul, yet all of them had ſouls, and ſouls of the ſame nature: Or as thoſe Phyſicians who diſpute whether the brain or heart be the principal part of a man, yet all of them have brains and have hearts, and herein agree ſufficiently: So likewiſe, though ſome Proteſtants eſteem that Doctrin the ſoul of the Church, which others do not ſo highly value, yet this hinders not but that which is indeed the ſoul of the Church may be in both ſorts of them; and though one account that a neceſſary truth which others account neither neceſſary nor perhaps true, yet this notwithſtanding, in thoſe Truths which are truly and really neceſſary they may all agree. For no Argument can be more ſophiſtical than this: They differ in ſome points which they eſteem neceſſary; Therefore they differ in ſome that indeed and in truth are ſo.

35. Now

35. Now as concerning the other inference, *That they cannot agree what points are fundamental:* I have ſaid and proved formerly that there is no ſuch neceſſity as you imagin or pretend, that men ſhould certainly know what is, and what is not fundamental. They that believe all things plainly delivered in Scripture, believe all things fundamental, and are at ſufficient Unity in matters of Faith, though they cannot preciſely and exactly diſtinguiſh between what is fundamental and what is profitable: nay though by error they miſtake ſome vain, or perhaps hurtful opinions for neceſſary and fundamental Truths. Beſides, I have ſhewed above, that as Proteſtants do not agree (for you over-reach in ſaying they cannot) touching what points are fundamental; ſo neither do you agree what points are defined and ſo to be accounted, and what are not: nay, nor concerning the ſubject in which God hath placed this pretended Authority of defining: ſome of you ſetling it in the Pope himſelf, though alone without a Council: Others in a Council, though divided from the Pope: Others only in the conjunction of Council and Pope: Others not in this neither, but in the acceptation of the preſent Church Univerſal: Laſtly, others not attributing it to this neither, but only to the perpetual Succeſſion of the Church of all Ages: of which divided Company it is very evident and undeniable, that every former may be and are obliged to hold many things defined and therefore neceſſary, which the latter, according to their own grounds, have no obligation to do, nay cannot do ſo upon any firm and ſure and infallible foundation.

Cap. 3. §. 53. *& alibi.*

FINIS.

OUT OF

Mr. *Chillingworth's* Manuſcript.

A LETTER TO

Mr. LEWGAR,

CONCERNING THE

Church of Romes

Being the Guide of Faith and Judge of Controverſies.

Good Mr. LEWGAR,

THough I am reſolved not to be much afflicted for the loſs of that which is not in my power to keep, yet I cannot deny, but the loſs of a friend goes very near unto my heart: and by this name of a friend, I did preſume till of late, that I might have called you, becauſe, though perhaps for want of power and opportunity, I have done you no good office, yet I have been always willing and ready to do you the beſt ſervice I could: and therefore I cannot but admire at that affected ſtrangeneſs which, in your laſt Letter to me, you ſeem to take upon you, renouncing in a manner all relation to me, and tacitly excommunicating me from all intereſt in you: the *Superſcription* of your

Letter is to Mr. *William Chillingworth*, and your *Subscription John Lewgar*, as if you either disdained or made a conscience of stiling me your friend, or your self mine. If this proceed from passion and weakness, I pray mend it; if from reason I pray shew it: If you think me one of those to whom Saint *John* forbids you to say *God save you*, then you are to think and prove me one of those Deceivers which deny Christ Jesus to be *come in the flesh*. If you think me an Heretick and therefore to be avoided, you must prove me *avtocatdikos*, condemned by my own judgment; which I know I cannot, and therefore I think you cannot: If you say I *do not hear the Church*, and therefore am to be esteemed an *Heathen* or *Publican*; you are to prove that by the Church there is meant the Church of *Rome:* and yet when you have done so, I hope Christians are not forbidden to shew humanity and civility, even to *Pagans:* for Gods sake, Mr. *Lewgar*, free your self from this blind zeal, at least for a little space; and consider with reason and moderation what strange crime you can charge me with, that should deserve this strange usage, especially from you: Is it a crime to endeavour with all my understanding to find your Religion true, and to make my self a believer of it, and not be able to do so? Is it a crime to imploy all my reason upon the justification of the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, and to find it impossible to be justified? I will call God to witness, who knows my heart better than you do, that I have evened the scale of my judgment as much as possibly I could, and have not willingly allowed any one grain of worldly motives on either side; but have weighed the Reasons for your Religion and against with such indifference, as if there were nothing in the world but God and my self; and is it my fault, that that scale goes down which hath the most weight in it? that that building falls, which has a false foundation? have you such power over your understanding, that you can believe what you please, though you see no reason, or that you can suspend your belief when you do see reason? If you have, I pray for our old

friend-

friendſhips ſake teach me that trick; but until I have learnt it, I pray blame me not for going the ordinary way; I mean for believing or not believing as I ſee reaſon: If you can convince me of wilful oppoſition againſt the known truth, of negligence in ſeeking it, of unwillingneſs to find it, of preferring temporal reſpects before it, or of any other fault, which is in my power to amend, that is indeed a fault, if I amend it not, be as angry with me as you pleaſe. But to impute to me involuntary errors; or that I do not ſee that which I would ſee, but cannot; or that I will not profeſs that which I do not believe; certainly this is far more unreaſonable error, than any which you can juſtly charge me with; for let me tell you, the imputing *Socinianiſm* to me, whoſoever was the author of it, was a wicked and groundleſs ſlander.

Perhaps you will ſay, for this is the uſual ſong on that ſide, that pride is a voluntary fault, and with this I am juſtly chargeable for forſaking that guide which God has appointed me to follow: But what if I forſook it, becauſe I thought I had reaſon to fear, it was one of thoſe blind guides which whoſoever blindly follows, is threatned by our Saviour that both he and his guide ſhall fall into the Ditch; then I hope you will grant it was not pride, but Conſcience that moved me to do ſo; for as it is wiſe humility to obey thoſe whom God hath ſet over me, ſo it is ſinful credulity to follow every man or every Church, that without warrant will take upon them to guide me: ſhew me then ſome good and evident title which the Church of *Rome* has to this office, produce but one reaſon for it which upon trial will not finally be reſolved and vaniſh into uncertainties; and if I yield not unto it, ſay if you pleaſe I am as proud as Lucifer: in the mean time give me leave to think it ſtrange and not far from a Prodigee, that this Doctrin of the *Roman* Churches being the guide of faith, if it be true doctrin, ſhould either not be known to the four Evangeliſts, or if it were known to them, that being wiſe and good men, they ſhould either

be ſo envious of the Churches happineſs; or ſo forgetful of the work they took in hand, which was to write the Goſpel of Chriſt, as that not ſo much as one of them ſhould mention ſo much as once, this ſo neceſſary part of the Goſpel, without the belief whereof there is no ſalvation, and with the belief whereof, unleſs men be ſnatcht away by ſudden death, there is hardly any damnation. It is evident they do all of them, with one conſent, ſpeak very plainly of many things of no importance in compariſon hereof: and is it credible or indeed poſſible that with one conſent or rather conſpiracy, they ſhould be ſo deeply ſilent concerning this *unum neceſſarium*? You may believe it if you can, for my part I cannot, unleſs I ſee demonſtration for it: for if you ſay they ſend us to the Church, and conſequently to the Church of *Rome*: this is to ſuppoſe that which can never be proved, that the Church of *Rome* is the only Church; and without this ſuppoſal, upon Diviſion of the Church, I am as far to ſeek for a guide of my Faith as ever. As for example,

In that great diviſion of the Church when the whole world wondred, ſaith Saint *Hierom*, that it was become *Arrian*: when *Liberius* Biſhop of *Rome* (as S. *Athanaſius*, and S. *Hilary* teſtifie) ſubſcribed their Hereſie, and joyned in Communion with them: Or in the diviſion between the *Greek* and the *Roman* Church about the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, when either ſide was the Church to it ſelf, and each part Heretical and Schiſmatical to the other; what direction could I then an ignorant man have found from that Text of Scripture, *Unleſs he hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen or a Publican*: or *Upon this Rock will I build my Church and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.*

Again, give me leave to wonder, that neither S. *Paul* writing to the *Romans* ſhould ſo much as intimate this their priviledge of Infallibility, but rather on the contrary put them in fear in the eleventh Chapter, that they as well as the Jews were in danger of falling away.

That

That Saint *Peter*, the pretended Biſhop of *Rome*, writing two Catholick Epiſtles, mentioning his departure, ſhould not once acquaint the Chriſtians whom he writes to, what guide they were to follow, after he was taken from them.

That the writers of the New Teſtament, ſhould ſo frequently forewarn men of Hereticks, falſe Chriſts, falſe prophets, and not once arm them againſt them, with letting them know this onely ſure means of avoiding their danger.

That ſo great a part of the New Teſtament ſhould be imployed about Antichriſt, and ſo little or indeed none at all, about the Vicar of Chriſt, and the guide of the faithful.

That our Saviour ſhould leave this onely means for the ending of Controverſies, and yet ſpeak ſo obſcurely and ambiguouſly of it, that now our Judge is the greateſt Controverſie, and the greateſt hinderance of ending them.

That there ſhould be better evidence in the Scripture to intitle the *King* to this Office who diſclaims it, than the *Pope* who pretends it.

That S. *Peter* ſhould not ever exerciſe over the Apoſtles, any one act of Juriſdiction, nor they ever give him any one Title of Authority over them.

That if the Apoſtles did know S. *Peter* was made head over them, when our Saviour ſaid, *Thou art Peter*, &c. they ſhould ſtill contend who ſhould be the firſt; and that our Saviour ſhould never tell them S. *Peter* was the man.

That S. *Paul* ſhould ſay, he was in nothing inferiour to the very chief Apoſtles.

That the Catechumeniſts in the primitive Church ſhould never be taught this foundation of their Faith, that the Church of *Rome* was Guide of their Faith.

That the Fathers, *Tertullian*, S. *Hierom* and *Optatus*, when they flew higheſt in commendation of the *Roman* Church, ſhould attribute no more to her than to all other Apoſtolical Churches.

That

That in the Controverſie about *Eaſter*, the Biſhops and Churches of *Aſia*, ſhould be ſo ill Catechiſed as not to know this Principle of Chriſtian Religion——The neceſſity of Conformity in Doctrin with the Church of *Rome*. That they ſhould never be preſſed with any ſuch neceſſity of conformity in all things, but onely with the Tradition of the Weſtern Churches in that point.

That *Irenæus* and many other Biſhops (notwithſtanding *ad hanc Eccleſiam neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam*) ſhould not yet think that a neceſſary Doctrin, nor a ſufficient ground of Excommunication, which the Church of *Rome* thought to be ſo.

That S. *Cyprian* and the Biſhops of *Africk*, ſhould be ſo ill inſtructed in their Faith, as not to know this foundation of it. That they likewiſe were never urged with any ſuch neceſſity of Conformity with the Church of *Rome*, nor ever charged with hereſie or error for denying it.

That when *Liberius* joyned in Communion with the *Arrians* and ſubſcribed their hereſie, the *Arrians* then ſhould not be the Church, and the Guide of Faith.

That never any Hereticks for three Ages after Chriſt, were preſſed with this Argument of the Infallibility of the preſent Church of *Rome*, or charged with denyal of it, as a diſtinct Hereſie; ſo that *Æneas Sylvius* ſhould have cauſe to ſay, *Ante tempora Concilii Niceni, quiſq; ſibi vivebat, & parvus reſpectus habebatur ad Eccleſiam Romanam.* That the Eccleſiaſtical Story of thoſe times mentions no Acts of Authority of the Church of *Rome* over other Churches; as if there ſhould be a Monarchy, and the Kings for ſome Ages together ſhould exerciſe no act of Juriſdiction in it.

That to ſupply this defect, the Decretal Epiſtles ſhould be ſo impudently forged, which in a manner ſpeak nothing elſe but *Reges & Monarchas*; I mean, the Popes making Laws for exerciſing authority over all other Churches.

That the *African* Churches in S. *Auſtins* time ſhould be ignorant that the Pope was Head of the Church and Judge of Appeals *jure divino*; and that there was a neceſſity

ceſſity of Conformity with the Church, in this and all other points of Doctrin.

Nay that the *Popes* themſelves ſhould be ſo ignorant of the true ground of this their Authority, as to pretend to it, not upon Scripture or univerſal Tradition, but upon an imaginary pretended none-ſuch Canon of the Council of *Nice*.

That *Vincentius Lirinenſis* ſeeking for a guide of his Faith and a preſervative from Hereſie, ſhould be ignorant of this ſo ready one, The Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*.

All theſe things and many more are very ſtrange to me, if the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church be indeed and were always by Chriſtians acknowledged the foundation of our Faith: And therefore I beſeech you pardon me, if I chooſe to build mine, upon one that is much firmer and ſafer, and lies open to none of theſe objections, which is Scripture and univerſal Tradition; and if one that is of this Faith may have leave to do ſo; I will ſubſcribe with hand and heart,

Your very loving and true Friend

W. C.

A TABLE

A TABLE OF Contents.

Note that the firſt Figure refers to the Chapter, the other to the diviſions of each Chapter.

A.

PRoteſtants *agree* in more things than they differ in, by believing the Scripture. *chap.* 4. *div.* 49. 50.

We have as many rational means of *Agreement* as the Papiſts. *c.* 3. 7, 8.

Papiſts pretend to means of *agreement*, and do not agree. *c.* 3. 3,4,5,6.

Not neceſſary to find a Church *agreeing* with Proteſtants in all points. Anſ. pref. 19. & *c.* 5.27.

Antiquity vainly pleaded for *Romiſh* Doctrins and Practices, ſince many Errors are more ancient than ſome of their Doctrins. *c.* 5. 91.

The *Apoſtolick* Church an Infallible Guide to which we may reſort, being preſent to us by her Writings. *c.* 3. 69, 80.

That the Church has power to make new *Articles* of Faith, aſſerted by the *Romiſh* Doctors. *c.* 4. 18.

This one *Article*, I *believe the Roman Catholick Church to be Infallible*, if their Doctrin were true, would ſecure againſt hereſie, more than the whole Creed. *c.* 4. 77, 78, 79, 83.

Chriſts *aſſiſtance* promiſed to the Church, to lead her into more than neceſſary truths. *c.* 5. 61, 62.

Atheiſm and irreligion ſprings eaſily from ſome *Romiſh* Doctrins and Practices. *Pref.* 7, 8.

A Table of Contents.

S. *Auſtins* ſaying, *Evangelio non crederem*, &c. how to be underſtood. *c.* 2. 54, 97, 98, 99.
S. *Auſtins* Teſtimony againſt the *Donatiſts*, not cogent againſt *Proteſtants*. *c.* 2. 163.
S. *Auſtins* words, *No neceſſity to divide unity*, explained. *c.* 5. 10.
The *Authors* vindication from ſuſpition of Hereſie. *Pref.* 28.
The *Authors* motives to turn a Papiſt, with anſwers to them. *Pref.* 42, 43.

B.

The *Bible* which is the Religion of Proteſtants, to be preferred before the way of *Romiſh* Religion, ſhewed at large. *c.* 6. from 56. to 72. Incluſive.

C.

The *Calviniſts* rigid Doctrin of Predetermination, unjuſtly reproached by Papiſts, who communicate with thoſe that hold the ſame. *c.* 7. 30.
To give a *Catalogue* of our Fundamentals not neceſſary nor poſſible. *Anſ. Pref.* 27. & *c.* 3. 13, 53.
Want of ſuch a *Catalogue*, leaves us not uncertain in our Faith. *c.* 3. 14.
Papiſts as much bound to give a *Catalogue* of the Churches propoſals, which are their Fundamentals, and yet do it not. *c.* 3. 53.
Our general *Catalogue* of Fundamentals as good as theirs. *c.* 4. 12. *c.* 7. 35.
Moral *certainty* a ſufficient Foundation of Faith. *c.* 2. 154.
A Proteſtant may have *certainty*, though diſagreeing Proteſtants all pretend to like certainty. *c.* 7. 13.
What *Charity* Papiſts allow to us Proteſtants, and we to them. *c.* 1. 1, 3, 4, 5.
A *Charitable* judgment ſhould be made of ſuch as err, but lead good lives. *c.* 7. 33.
Proteſtant *Charity* to Ignorant Papiſts; no comfort to them that will not ſee their errors. *c.* 5. 76.
The *Church* how furniſhed with means to determin Controverſies. *c.* 1. 7, 11.
Commands in Scripture to hear the Church and obey it, ſuppoſe it not infallible. *c.* 3. 41.
We may be a *true Church*, though deriving Ordination and receiving Scripture from a falſe one. *c.* 6. 54.
Common truths believed, may preſerve them good that otherwiſe err. *c.* 7. 33.
Conſcience in ſome caſes will juſtifie ſeparation, though every pretence of it will not. *c.* 5. 108.
Concord in damned errors, worſe than diſagreement in controverted points *c.* 5. 72.
The *Conſequences* of mens Opinions, may be unjuſtly charged upon them. *c.* 1. 12. *c.* 7. 30.
What *Contradictions* Papiſts believe, who hold Tranſubſtantiation. *c.* 4. 46.

All

All *Controverſies* in Religion not neceſſary to be determined. *c.* 1. 7, 156. & *c.* 3. 88.
How *Controverſies* about Scripture it ſelf are to be decided. *c.* 2. 27.
Controverſies not neceſſary to be decided by a Judicial ſentence, without any appeal. *c.* 2. 85.
That the *Creed* contains all neceſſary points, and how to be underſtood. *c.* 4. 23, 73, 74.
Not neceſſary that our *Creed* ſhould be larger than that of the Apoſtles. *c.* 4. 67, 70, 71, 72.
Whether it be contrary to the *Creed*, to ſay the Church may fail. *c.* 5. 31.

D.

S. *Dennis* of *Alexandria's* ſaying explained, about not dividing the Church. *c.* 5. 12.
To *deny* a Truth witneſſed by God, whether always damnable —— *Anſ. Pref.* 9.
The Apoſtles *depoſiting* Truth with the Church, no argument that ſhe ſhould always keep it ſincere and intire. *c.* 2. 148.
Of *Diſagreeing* Proteſtants, though one ſide muſt err, yet both may hope for ſalvation. *Anſ. Pref.* 22. & *c.* 1. 10, 13, 17.
Two may *diſagree* in a matter of faith, and yet neither be chargeable with denying a declared Truth of Gods. *Anſ. Pref.* 10.
Differences among Proteſtants vainly objected againſt them. *c.* 3. 2, 3, 5. & *c.* 5. 72.
No reaſon to reproach them for their *differences* about neceſſary Truths and damnable Errors. *c.* 3. 52.
What is requiſite to convince a man that a *Doctrin* comes from God. *Anſ. Pref.* 8.
Believing the *Doctrin* of Scripture, a man may be ſaved, though he did not believe it to be the word of God. *c.* 2. 159.
The *Donatiſts* error about the Catholick Church, what it was and was not. *c.* 3. 64.
The *Donatiſts* caſe and ours not alike. *c.* 5. 103.
The *Roman* Church guilty of the *Donatiſts* Error, in perſwading men as good not to be Chriſtians, as not *Roman* Catholicks. *c.* 3. 64.
Papiſts liker to the *Donatiſts* than we, by their uncharitable denying ſalvation out of their Church. *c.* 7. 21, 22, 27.

E.

Engliſh Divines vindicated from inclining to Popery, and for want of skill in School-Divinity. *Pref.* 19.
How *Errors* may be damnable. *Anſ. Pref.* 22.
In what caſe *Errors* damnable, may not damn thoſe that hold them. *c.* 5. 58. & *c.* 6. 14.
In what caſe *Errors* not damnable, may be damnable to thoſe that hold them. *c.* 5. 66.

No man to be reproached for quitting his *Errors*. *c.* 5. 103.
Though we may pardon the *Roman* Church for her *Errors*, yet we may not ſin with it. *c.* 5. 70.
Errors of the *Roman* Church that endanger ſalvation to be forſaken, though they are not deſtructive of it. *c.* 7. 6.
Erring perſons that lead good lives, ſhould be judged of charitably. *c.* 7. 33.
A man may learn of the Church to confute its *Errors*. *c.* 3. 40.
We did well to forſake the *Roman* Church for her *Errors*, though we afterwards may err out of it. *c.* 5. 63, 64, 65, 67, 87, 92.
We muſt not adhere to a Church in profeſſing the leaſt *Errors*, leſt we ſhould not profeſs with her neceſſary Doctrin. *c.* 3. 56.
The *Examples* of thoſe that forſaking Popiſh Errors, have denied neceſſary Truths, no Argument againſt Proteſtants. *c.* 3. 63.
External Communion of a Church may be left without leaving a Church. *c.* 5. 32, 45, 47.

F.

Whether *Faith* be deſtroyed, by denying a Truth teſtified by God. *Anſ. Pref.* 25. *c.* 6. 49. *c.* 7. 19.
The Objects of *Faith* of two ſorts, eſſential and occaſional. *c.* 4. 3.
Certainty of *Faith* leſs than the higheſt degree, may pleaſe God and ſave a man. *c.* 1. 8. & 6. 3, 4, 5.
Faith leſs than infallibly certain may reſiſt temptations & difficulties *c.* 6. 5.
There may be *Faith* where the Church and its infallibility begets it not. *c.* 2. 49.
Faith does not go before Scripture, but follows its efficacy. *c.* 2. 48.
Proteſtants have ſufficient means to know the certainty of their *Faith* *c.* 2. 152.
In the *Roman* Church, the laſt reſolution of *Faith* is into Motives of Credibility. *c.* 2. 154.
The *Fathers* declared their Judgment of Articles, but did not require their declarations to be received under Anathema. *c.* 4. 18.
Proteſtants did not *forſake* the Church, though they forkſook its errors. *c.* 3. 11.
Sufficient *Foundation* for faith without infallible certainty. *c.* 6. 6, 45.
What Proteſtants mean by *Fundamental Doctrins*. *c.* 4. 52.
In what ſenſe the Church of *Rome* errs not *Fundamentally*. *Anſ. Pref.* 20.
To be unerring in *Fundamentals*, can be ſaid of no Church of one denomination. *c.* 3. 55.
To ſay that there ſhall be always a Church not erring in *Fundamentals*, is to ſay that there ſhall be always a Church. *c.* 3. 55.
A Church is not ſafe, though retaining *Fundamentals*, when it builds hay and ſtubble on the foundation, and neglects to reform her Errors. *c.* 5. 61.
Ignorance of what points in particular are *fundamental*, does not make it uncertain whether we do not err fundamentally, or differ in fundamentals among our ſelves. *c.* 7. 14.

G.

The four *Goſpels* contain all neceſſary Doctrins. *c.* 4.40,41,42,43.
An *Infallible Guide* not neceſſary for avoiding Hereſie. *c.* 2. 127.
The Apoſtolick Church an *Infallible Guide* to which we may reſort *c.* 3.69.
The Church may not be an *Infallible Guide* in fundamentals, though it be infallible in fundamentals. *c.* 3.39.
That the *Roman* Church ſhould be the only *infallible Guide* of Faith, and the Scriptures ſay nothing concerning it, is incredible. *c.* 6. 20.

H.

The difference betwixt *Hereſie* and Schiſm. *c.* 5. 51.
There are no New *Hereſies*, no more than new Articles of Faith. *c.* 4. 18,37,38.
Separation from the Church of *Rome* no mark of *Hereſie* by the Fathers, whoſe Citations are anſwered. *c.*6.22,23.24,25.26,27,2 ,30,31,33,34.
No mark of *Hereſie* to want ſucceſſion of Biſhops, holding the ſame Doctrin. *c.*6.18,41.
We are not *Heretricks* for oppoſing things propounded by the Church of *Rome* for divine Truth. *c.* 6. 11, 12.
Whether Proteſtants Schiſmatically cut off the *Roman* Church from hopes of ſalvation. *c.* 5. 38.

I.

The *Jewiſh Church* had no *Infallibility* annexed to it, and if it had, there is no neceſſity that the Chriſtian Church ſhould have it. *c.* 2. 141.
The *Impoſing* a neceſſity of profeſſing known errors, and practiſing known corruptions, is a juſt cauſe of ſeparating from a Church. *c.* 5. 31,36,40,50,59,60,68,69.
Indifference to all Religions falſely charged upon Proteſtants. *Anſ. Pref.* 3. & *c.* 3. 12.
The belief of the Churches *Infallibility* makes way for Hereſie. *Pref.* 10.
An *Infallible Guide* not needful for avoiding Hereſies. *c.* 2. 127.
The Churches *Infallibility* has not the ſame Evidence, as there is for the Scriptures. *c.* 3. 30, 31.
The Churches *Infallibility* can no way be better aſſured to us, than the Scriptures incorruption. *c.* 2.25. & *c.* 3. 27.
The Churches *Infallibility* is not proved from the promiſe that *the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* c. 3. 70.
Nor from the promiſe of the *Spirits leading into all Truth*, which was made onely to the Apoſtles. *c.* 3. 71, 72.
The Churches infallibility not proved from *Epheſ.*4.11,12,13. *He gave ſome Apoſtles* &c. *till we all come in the Unity of the Faith*, &c. *c.*3. 79, 80.
That God has appointed an *Infalible Judge* of Controverſies, becauſe ſuch a one is deſirable and uſeful, is a weak concluſion. *c.* 2. from 128. to 136. incluſive.
Infallibility in fundamentals, no warrant to adhere to a Church in all that ſhe propoſes. *c.* 3. 57.

In-

Infallible interpretations of Scripture vainly boasted of by the *Roman* Church. *c.* 2. 93,94,95.

Whether the denial of the Churches *Infallibility* leaves men to their private spirit, reason and discourse, and what is the harm of it. *Pref.* 12. 13. & *c.* 2. 110.

Traditional *Interpretations* of Scripture how ill preserved. *c.* 2. 10.

Interpretations of Scripture which private men make for themselves (not pretending to prescribe their sense to others) though false or seditious, endanger only themselves. *c.* 2. 122.

Allow the Pope or *Roman* Church to be a decisive *Interpreter* of Christs Laws, and she can evacuate them, and make what Laws she pleases. *Pref.* 10.11. & *c.* 2. 1.

S. *Irenæus's* account of Tradition favours not Popery. *c.* 2. 144,145,146.

His saying that no Reformation can countervail the danger of a Schism, explained. *c.* 5. 11.

A living *Judge* to end Controversies about the sense of Scripture, not necessary. *c.* 2. 12,13.

If Christ had intended such a *Judge* in Religion, he would have named him, which he has not done. *c.* 2. 23. *c.* 3. 69. *c.* 6. 20.

Though a living *Judge* be necessary to determin Civil causes, yet not necessary for Religious causes. *c.* 2. from 14. to 22. inclus.

If there be a *Judge* of Controversies, no necessity it should be the *Roman* Church. *c.* 3. 69.

Roman Catholicks set up as many Judges in Religion as Protestants. *c.* 2. 116, 118, 153.

A *Judgment of discretion* must be allowed to every man for himself, about Religion. *c.* 2. 11.

The Protestant Doctrin of *Justification*, taken altogether, not a licentious doctrin. *c.* 7. 30.

When they say they are *justified by faith alone*, yet they make good works necessary to salvation. *c.* 7. 30.

K.

Our obligation to *know* any divine truth, arises from Gods manifest revealing it. *c.* 3. 19.

L.

How we are assured in what *Language* the Scripture is uncorrupted. *c.* 2. 55, 56, 57.

To *leave* a Church, and to leave the external Communion of a Church, is not the same thing. *c.* 5. 32, 45, 47.

Luthers separation not like that of the *Donatists*, and why. *c.* 5. 33. 101.

Luther and his followers did not divide from the whole Church, being a part of it, but onely reformed themselves, forsaking the corrupt part. *c.* 5. 56.

Luthers opposing himself to all in his reformation, no objection against him. *c.* 5. 89, 90.

We are not bound to justifie all that *Luther* said and did, no more than Papists are bound to justifie what several Popes have said and done. *c.* 5. 112.

M.

They may be *members* of the Catholick Church, that are not united in external Communion. *c.* 3. 9.
The Protestant Doctrin of *Merit* explained. *c.* 4.35,36.
The Authors *Motives* to change his Religions, with Answers to them. *Pref.* 42. 43.
The Faith of Papists resolved at last into the *Motives* of Credibility. *c.* 2. 154.
The *Mischiefs* that followed the Reformation, not imputable to it. *c.* 5. 92.

N.

What make points *necessary* to be believed. *c.* 4. 4, 11. No more is *necessary* to be believed by us, than by the Apostles. *c.* 4.67,70,71,72.
Papists make many things *necessary* to salvation, which God never made so. *c.* 7. 7.
All *necessary* points of Faith are contained in the Creed. *c.* 4.73,74.
Why some points not so *necessary* were put into the Creed. *c.* 4. 75,76.
Protestants may agree in *necessary* points, though they may overvalue some things they hold. *c.* 7. 34.
To impose a *necessity* of professing known errors, and practising known corruptions, is a just cause of separation. *c.* 5.31,36,40,50,59,60,68, 69.

O.

A blind *obedience* is not due to Ecclesiastical decisions, though our practise must be determined by the sentence of superiours in doubtful cases. *c.* 5. 110.
A probable *opinion* may be followed (according to the *Roman* Doctors) though it be not the safest way for avoiding sin. *c.* 7, 8.
Optatus's saying impertinently urged against Protestants. *c.* 5.99,100.
Though we receive *Ordination* and Scripture from a false Church, yet we may be a true Church. *c.* 6. 54.

P.

Whether *Papists* or *Protestants* most hazard their souls on probabilities. *c.* 4. 57.
What we believe concerning the *Perpetuity* of the Visible Church. *Ans. Pref.* 18.
Whether 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *The Pillar and ground of Truth*, belong to *Timothy* or to the Church. *c.* 3.76.
If those words belong to the Church, whether they may not signifie her duty, and yet that she may err in neglecting it. *c.* 3. 77.
A *possibility* of being deceived, argues not an uncertainty in all we believe. *c.* 3. 26,50, *c.* 5. 107. *c.* 6. 47.
By joyning in the *Prayers* of the *Roman* Church, we must joyn in her unlawful practices. *c.* 3. 11.
Preaching of the Word and administring the Sacrament, how they are inseparable notes of the Church, and how they make it visible. *c.* 5.19.

Private Spirit, how we are to understand it. *c.* 2. 110.
Private Spirit is not appealed to (*i. e.* to dictates pretending to come from Gods spirit) when Controversies are referred to Scripture. *c.* 2. 110.
Whether one is left to his *private* spirit, reason and discourse, by denying the Churches infallibility, and the harm of it. *Pref.* 12, 13. & *c.* 2. 110.
A mans *private judgment* may be opposed to the publick, when Reason and Scripture warrant him. *c.* 5. 109.
A *probable opinion*, according to the *Roman* Doctors, may be followed, though it is not the safest way for avoiding sin. *c.* 7. 8.
It's hard for Papists to resolve, what is a *sufficient proposal* of the Church. *c.* 3. 54.
Protestants are on the surer side for avoiding sin, and *Papists* on the more dangerous side to commit sin, shewed in instances. *c.* 7. 9.

R.

Every man by *Reason* must judge both of Scripture and the Church. *c.* 2. 111, 112, 113, 118, 120, 122.
Reason and judgment of discretion, is not to be reproached for the private spirit. *c.* 2. 110.
If men must not follow their *Reason*, what they are to follow. *c.* 2. 114, 115.
Some kind of *Reformation* may be so necessary, as to justifie separation from a corrupt Church, though every pretence of reformation will not. *c.* 5. 53.
Nothing is more against *Religion*, than using violence to introduce it. *c.* 5. 96.
The *Religion* of Protestants (which is the belief of the Bible) a wiser and safer way than that of the *Roman* Church, shewed at large. *c.* 6. from 56. to 72. Inclus.
All Protestants require *Repentance* to remission of sins, and remission of sins to Justification. *c.* 7. 31.
No *Revelations* known to be so, may be rejected as not Fundamental. *c.* 4. 11.
A Divine *revelation* may be ignorantly disbelieved by a Church, and yet it may continue a Church. *c.* 3. 20.
Things equally *revealed*, may not be so to several persons. *c.* 3. 24.
Papists cannot have *Reverence* for the Scripture, whilst they advance so many things contrary to it. *c.* 2. 1.
No argument of their *reverence* to it, that they have preserved it intire. *c.* 2. 2.
The *Roman Church*, when *Luther* separated, was not *the visible Church*, though *a visible* Church, and part of the Catholick. *c.* 5. 26, 27.
The present *Roman Church* has lost all Authority to recommend what we are to believe in Religion. *c.* 2. 191.
The properties of a *perfect Rule*. *c.* 2. 5. 6, 7.
Whether the Popish *Rule* of Fundamentals, or ours is the safest. *c.* 4. 63.

S.

Right administration of *Sacraments* uncertain in the *Roman* Church. *c.* 2. from 63. to 68. inclusive.

In

In what ſenſe *Salvation* may be had in the *Roman* Church. *Anſ. Pref.* 5, 7.
Salvation depends upon great uncertainties in the *Roman* Church. *c.* 2. from 63. to 73. incluſ.
Schiſms whence they chiefly ariſe, and what continues them. *c.* 4. 17.
Schiſm may be a Diviſion of the Church, as well as from it. *c.* 5. 22.
He may be no *Schiſmatick*, that forſakes a Church for Errors not damnable. *Anſ. Pref.* 2.
No *Schiſm* to leave a corrupted Church, when otherwiſe we muſt communicate in her corruptions. *c.* 5. 25.
Not every ſeparation from the external Communion of the Church, but a cauſeleſs one, is the ſin of *Schiſm*. *c.* 5. 30.
They may not be *Schiſmaticks* that continue the ſeparation from *Rome*, though *Luther* that began it, had been a *Schiſmatick*. *c.* 5. 4. & *c.* 6. 14.
The *Scripture* cannot be duly reverenced by Papiſts. *c.* 2. *n.* 1.
The *Scripture* how proved to be the word of God. *c.* 4. 53.
The Divine Authority of the *Scripture* may be certain, though it be not ſelf-evidently certain, that it is Gods word. *c.* 6. 51.
Books of *Scripture* now held for Canonical, which the *Roman* Church formerly rejected. *c.* 2. 90, 91.
Whether ſome Books of *Scripture* defined for Canonical, were not afterward rejected. *c.* 3. 29.
The *Scripture* in things neceſſary is intelligible to learned and unlearned. *c.* 2. 104, 105, 106.
Some Books of *Scripture* queſtioned by the Fathers as well as by Proteſtants. *c.* 2. 34.
The *Scripture* has great Authority from internal Arguments. *c.* 2. 47.
The Truth of *Scripture* inſpiration depends not on the authority of the *Roman* Church. *Pref.* 14. & *c.* 6. 45.
If the *Scriptures* contain all neceſſary truths, Popery is confuted. *Pref.* 30. to 38. incluſive.
The true meaning of *Scripture* not uncertain in neceſſary points. *c.* 2. 84.
A determinate ſenſe of obſcure places of *Scripture*, is not needful. *c.* 2. 127, 150.
The ſenſe of plain places of Scripture, may be known by the ſame means, by which the Papiſts know the ſence of thoſe places that prove the Church. *c.* 2. 150, 151.
God may give means to the Church to know the true ſenſe of *Scripture*, yet it is not neceſſary it ſhould have that ſenſe. *c.* 2. 93.
It is eaſier to know the *Scripture* and its ſenſe, than for the ignorant in the *Roman* Church which is the Church, and what are her decrees, and the ſenſe of them. *c.* 2. 107, 108, 109.
In what Language the *Scripture* is incorrupted, and the aſſurance of it. *c.* 2. 55, 56, 57.
The *Scripture* is capable of the properties of a perfect Rule. *c.* 2. 7.
In what ſenſe we ſay the *Scripture* is a perfect Rule of Faith. *c.* 2. 8.
The *Scripture* not properly a judge of Controverſies, but a Rule to judge by. *c.* 2. 11, 104, 155.

The *Scriptures* incorruption more ſecured by providence, than the *Roman* Churches vigilancy. *c.* 2. 24.
When *Scripture* is made the Rule of Controverſies, thoſe that concern it ſelf are to be excepted. *c.* 2. 8, 27, 156.
The *Scripture* contains all neceſſary material objects of Faith, of which the Scripture it ſelf is none, but the means of conveying them to us. *c.* 2. 32. 159.
The *Scripture* muſt determine ſome Controverſies, elſe thoſe about the Church and its Notes are undeterminable. *c.* 2. 3.
The *Scripture* unjuſtly charged with increaſing Controverſies and Contentions. *c.* 2. 4.
The *Scripture* is a ſufficient means for diſcovering Hereſies. *c.* 2. 127.
When Controverſies are referred to Scripture, it is not referring them to the private ſpirit, underſtanding it of a perſwaſion pretending to come from the Spirit of God. *c.* 2. 110.
Proteſtants that believe *Scripture*, agree in more things than they differ in, and their differences are not material. *c.* 4. 49, 50.
Private men, if they interpret *Scriptures* amiſs and to ill purpoſes, endanger only themſelves, when they do not pretend to preſcribe to others. *c.* 2. 122.
The Proteſtants *Security* of the way to happineſs. *c.* 2. 53.
Want of Skill in *School-Divinity* fooliſhly objected againſt *Engliſh* Divines. *Pref.* 19.
The Principles of the Church of *Englands ſeparating* from *Rome*, will not ſerve to juſtifie Schiſmaticks. *c.* 5. 71, 74, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86.
Socinianiſm and other Hereſies countenanced by *Romiſh* Writers, who have undermined the Doctrin of the Trinity. *Pref.* 17. 18.
The promiſe of the *Spirits leading into all truth*, proves not Infallibility. *c.* 3. 71.
The promiſe of the *Spirits abiding with them for ever*, may be perſonal. *c.* 3. 74.
And it being a conditional promiſe, cuts off the *Roman* Churches pretence to infallibility. *c.* 3. 75.
Want of *Succeſſion* of Biſhops, holding always the ſame Doctrin, is not a mark of Hereſie. *c.* 6. 38, 41.
In what ſenſe *Succeſſion* is by the Fathers made a mark of the true Church. *c.* 6. 40.
Papiſts cannot prove a perpetual *Succeſſion* of Profeſſors of their Doctrin. *c.* 6. 41.

T.

Tradition proves the Books of Scripture to be Canonical, not the Authority of the preſent Church. *c.* 2. 25, 53, 90, 91, 92. & *c.* 3. 27.
Traditional Interpretations of Scripture how ill preſerved by the *Roman* Church. *c.* 2. 10. & *c.* 3. 46.
No *Traditional Interpretations* of Scripture, though if there were any remaining we are ready to receive them. *c.* 2. 88, 89. & *c.* 3. 46.

The

The *Traditions* diſtinct from Scripture which *Irenæus* mentions, do not favour Popery. *c.* 2. 144, 145, 146.
The aſſerting unwritten *Traditions*, though not inconſiſtent with the truth of Scripture, yet diſparages it as a perfect Rule. *c.* 2. 103
Though our *Tranſlations* of the Bible are ſubject to error, yet our ſalvation is not thereby made uncertain. *c.* 2. 68, 73.
Different *Tranſlations* of Scripture may as well be objected to the Ancient Church, as to Proteſtants. *c.* 2. 58, 59.
The Vulgar *Tranſlation* is not pure and uncorrupted. *c.* 2. 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80.
To believe *Tranſubſtantiation*, how many contradictions one muſt believe. *c.* 4. 46.
The Doctrin of the Trinity undermined by *Roman* Doctors. *Pref.* 17, 18.
The Church may *tolerate* many things, which ſhe does not allow. *c.* 3. 47.
Gods *Truth* not queſtioned by Proteſtants, though they deny points profeſſed by the Church. *c.* 1. 12.
Proteſtants queſtion not Gods *Truth*, though denying ſome truth revealed by him, if they know it not to be ſo revealed. *c.* 3. 18.
The *Truth* of the preſent Church, depends not upon the viſibility or perpetuity of the Church in all Ages. *c.* 5. 21. & *c.* 7. 20.
The Apoſtles depoſiting *Truth* with the Church, is no argument that ſhe ſhould always keep it intire and ſincere. *c.* 2. 148.
The promiſe of being *led into all truth*, agrees not equally to the Apoſtles and to the Church. *c.* 3. 34.
A *Tryal* of Religion by Scripture, may well be refuſed by Papiſts. *c.* 2, 3.

U.

Violence and force to introduce Religion, is againſt the nature of Religion, and unjuſtly charged upon Proteſtants. *c.* 5. 96.
What *Viſible Church* was before *Luther*, diſagreeing from the *Roman*. *Anſ. Pref.* 19. & *c.* 5. 27.
That there ſhould be always a *viſible* unerring Church, of one denomination, is not neceſſary. *c.* 5. 27.
The *Viſible Church* may not ceaſe, though it may ceaſe to be viſible. *c.* 5. 13, 14, 41.
The Church may not be *Viſible* in the Popiſh ſenſe, and yet may not diſſemble but profeſs her faith. *c.* 5. 18.
The great *uncertainties* ſalvation in the *Roman* Church depends on. *c.* 2. 63. to 73. inclusive.
Their *uncertainty* of the right adminiſtration of Sacraments. *c.* 2. 63. to 68. inclusive.
The Churches *Unity*, by what means beſt preſerved. *c.* 3. 81. *c.* 4. 13, 17, 40.
Pretence of Infallibility a ridiculous means to *Unity*, when that is the chief queſtion to be determined. *c.* 3. 89.
Unity of Communion how to be obtained. *c.* 4. 39, 40.

Unity of external Communion not neceſſary to the being a Member of the Catholick Church. *c.* 3. 9.

Univerſality of a Doctrin, no certain ſign that it came from the Apoſtles. *c.* 3. 44.

Want of *Univerſality* of place, proves not Proteſtants to be Hereticks, and may as well be objected againſt the *Roman* Church. *c.* 6. 42, 55.

We would receive *unwritten Traditions* derived from the Apoſtles, if we knew what they were. *c.* 3. 46.

The *Vulgar Tranſlation* not pure and incorrupted. *c.* 2. 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80.

W.

The *whole Doctrin* of Chriſt was taught by the Apoſtles, and an Anathema denounced againſt any that ſhould bring in new doctrins. *c.* 4. 18.

The *wiſdom* of Proteſtants juſtified, in forſaking the errors of the *Roman* Church. *c.* 6. 53, 54.

The wiſdom of Proteſtants ſhewed at large againſt the Papiſts, in making the Bible their Religion. *c.* 6. from 56. to 72. inclusive.

FINIS.

ADDITIONAL DISCOURSES OF Mr. Chillingworth NEVER BEFORE PRINTED.

Imprimatur.

Ex Ædib. Lambeth. Jun. 14. 1686.

GUIL. NEEDHAM RR. in Christo P. ac D. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacr. Domesticis.

LONDON,

Printed for *Richard Chiswell* at the *Rose* and *Crown* in S. *Pauls* Church-Yard, 1687.

PRINTED.

CONTENTS.

I. A *Conference betwixt Mr.* Chillingworth *and Mr.* Lewgar, *whether the* Roman Church *be the* Catholick-Church, *and all out of her Communion Hereticks or Schiſmaticks.* p. 1.

II. *A Diſcourſe againſt the Infallibility of the* Roman Church, *with an Anſwer to all thoſe Texts of Scripture that are alledged to prove it.* p. 26.

III. *A Conference concerning the Infallibility of the* Roman Church; *proving that the preſent Church of* Rome *either errs in her worſhiping the Bleſſed Virgin; or that the Ancient Church did err in condemning the* Collyridians *as Hereticks.* p. 41.

IV. *An Argument drawn from Communicating of Infants, as without which they could not be ſaved, againſt the Churches Infallibility.* p. 68.

V. *An Argument againſt Infallibility, drawn from the Doctrin of the* Millenaries. p. 80.

VI. *A Letter relating to the ſame ſubject.* p. 89.

VII.

VII. *An Argument againſt the* Roman *Churches Infallibility, taken from the Contradictions in their Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation.* p. 91.

VIII. *An account of what moved the Author to turn a Papiſt, with his Confutation of the Arguments that perſwaded him thereto.* p. 94.

IX. *A Diſcourſe concerning Tradition.* p. 103.

The Reader is desired to take notice of a great miſtake of the Printer and to Correct it, That he has made this the running Title over moſt of the Additional Pieces, *viz. A Conference betwixt* Mr. *Chillingworth and* Mr. *Lewgar*; which ſhould only have been ſet over the firſt: there are alſo ſome literal miſtakes, as pag. 65. ιεσυγιν twice for ιεσυγιν and ſuch like, not to be imputed to the Author.

A CON-

A CONFERENCE BETWIXT Mr. *CHILLINGWORTH* AND Mr. *LEWGAR*.

Theſis. THE Church of *Rome* (taken diffuſively for all Chriſtians communicating with the Biſhop of *Rome*) was the Judge of Controverſies at that time, when the Church of *England* made an alteration in her Tenents.

Argu. She was the Judge of Controverſies at that time, which had an Authority of deciding them. But the Church of *Rome* at that time had the Authority of deciding them. *Ergo.*

Anſw. A limited Authority to decide Controverſies according to the Rule of Scripture and Univerſal Tradition, and to oblige her own Members (ſo long as ſhe evidently contradicted not that Rule) to obedience I grant ſhe had: but an unlimited, an infallible Authority, or ſuch as could not but proceed according to that Rule, and ſuch as ſhould bind all the Churches in the World to Obedience (as the *Greek* Church) I ſay ſhe had not.

Queſt. When your Church hath decided a Controverſie, I deſire to know whether any particular Church or perſon hath Authority to reexamine her deciſion, whether

ſhe hath obſerved her Rule or no; and free himſelf from the obedience of it, by his or her particular judgment?

Anſw. If you underſtand by your Church, the Church Catholick, probably I ſhould anſwer no: but if you underſtand by your Church, that only which is in Subordination to the See of *Rome*, or if you underſtand a Council of this Church, I anſwer, yea.

Arg. That was the Catholick Church, which did abide in the Root of Apoſtolick Unity: But the Church of *Rome* at that time was the only Church that did abide in the Root of Apoſtolick Unity. *Ergo.*

Queſt. What mean you by Apoſtolick Unity?

Anſw. I mean the Unity of that Fellowſhip wherein the Apoſtles Lived and Died.

Queſt. Wherein was this Unity?

Anſw. Herein it conſiſted, that they all profeſſed one Faith, obeyed one Supream Tribunal, and communicated together in the ſame Prayers and Sacraments.

Solut. Then the Church of *Rome* continued not in this Apoſtolick Unity; for it continued not in the ſame Faith, wherein the Apoſtles Lived and Died: for though it retained ſo much (in my judgment) as was eſſential to the being of a Church, yet it degenerated from the Church of the Apoſtles times, in many things which were very profitable; as in Latin Service, and Communion in one kind.

Argu. Some Church did continue in the ſame Faith wherein the Apoſtles lived and died: But there was no Church at that time which did continue in the Apoſtles Faith beſides the *Roman* Church. *Ergo.*

Anſw. That ſome Church did continue in the Apoſtles Faith in all things neceſſary, I grant it: that any did continue in the Integrity of it, and in a perfect conformity with it in all things expedient and profitable, I deny it.

Queſt. Is it not neceſſary to a Churches continuing in the Apoſtles Faith, that ſhe continue in a perfect conformity with it in all things expedient and profitable?

Anſw. A perfect conformity in all things is neceſſary to a perfect continuance in the Apoſtles Faith; but to

an

an imperfect continuance, an imperfect conformity is ſufficient; and ſuch I grant the *Roman* Church had.

Queſt. Is not a perfect continuance in the Apoſtles Faith neceſſary to a Churches continuance in Apoſtolick Unity?

Anſw. It is neceſſary to a perfect continuance in Apoſtolick Unity.

Argu. There was ſome one company of Chriſtians at the time of *Luthers* riſing, which was the *Catholick Church*; But there was no other company at that time beſides the *Roman*: *Ergo*, the *Roman* at that time was the *Catholick Church*.

Anſw. There was no one company of Chriſtians, which in oppoſition to and Excluſion of all other companies of Chriſtians was the Catholick Church.

Argu. If the *Catholick Church* be ſome one company of Chriſtians in oppoſition to and excluſion of all other companies, then if there was ſome one company, ſhe was one in oppoſition to and excluſion of all other companies: But the *Catholick Church* is one company of Chriſtians in oppoſition to and excluſion of, *&c.* *Ergo*, There was then ſome one company which was the *Catholick Church* in oppoſition to and excluſion of all other companies.

The *Minor* proved by the Teſtimonies of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, teſtifying that they underſtood the Church to be *one* in the ſenſe alledged.

1. If this Unity which cannot be ſeparated at all or divided, is alſo among Hereticks, what contend we farther? Why call we them Hereticks, S. *Cypr. Epiſt.* 75.

2. But if there be but one Flock, how can he be accounted of the Flock, which is not within the number of it? *Id*: *Ibid.*

3. When *Parmenian* commends one Church, he condemns all the reſt; for beſides one, which is the true *Catholick*, other Churches are eſteemed to be among Hereticks, but are not. S. *Optat. lib.* 1.

4. The Church therefore is but one, this cannot be among all Hereticks and Schiſmaticks. *Ibid.*

5. You say you offer for the Church which is one; this very thing is part of a lie to call it one, which you have divided into two: *Id: Ibid.*

6. The Church is *one*, which cannot be amongst us and amongst you; it remains then, that it be in one only place. *Id: Ibid.*

7. Although there be many Hereſies of Chriſtians, and that all would be called *Catholicks*; yet there is always one Church, *&c. S. August. de util. credend. c. 7.*

8. The queſtion between us is, where the Church is, whether with us or with them, for She is but *one*. *Id: de unitat. c. 2.*

9. The proofs of the *Catholick* prevailed, whereby they evicted the Body of Chriſt to be with them, and by conſequence not to be with the *Donatiſts*, for it is manifeſt that She is *one* alone. *Id. Collat. Carthag. lib. 3.*

10. In illud cantica c. 7. *Thy Queens are two ſcore, and Concubines and Damoſels without number, but my Dove is one*, &c. He ſaid not, *my* Queens are *two*, and *ſcore Concubines*, &c. but he ſaid my Dove is but one; becauſe all the Sects of Philoſophers and Hereſies of Chriſtians are none of his; his is but one, to wit, the *Catholick* Church, *&c. S. Epiphan. in fine Panar.*

11. A man may not call the Conventicles of Hereticks (I mean *Marcionites*, *Manichees*, and the reſt) Churches; therefore the Tradition appoints you to ſay, *I believe one Holy Catholick Church*, &c. *S. Cyrill. Catech.* 18.

And theſe Teſtimonies I think are ſufficient to ſhew the judgment of the Ancient Church, that this Title of the Church *one*, is directly and properly excluſive to all companies beſides one; to wit, that where there are diverſe profeſſions of Faith, or diverſe Communions, there is but one of theſe, which can be the *Catholick Church*. Upon this ground I deſire ſome company of Chriſtians to be named, profeſſing a diverſe Faith, and holding a diverſe Communion from the *Roman*, which was the *Catholick Church* at the time of *Luthers* riſing: and if no other in this ſenſe can be named, than was She the *Catholick Church* at that time, and therefore her judgment to be reſted in,

and

and her Communion to be embraced upon peril of Schism and Heresie.

Mr. Chillingworths Answer.

Upon the same ground, if you pleased, you might desire a Protestant to name some Company of Christians, professing a diverse Faith, and holding a diverse Communion from the *Greek* Church, which was the Catholick Church at the time of *Luthers* rising; and seeing he could name no other in this sense, concludes that the *Greek* Church was the Catholick Church at that time. Upon the very same ground you might have concluded for the Church of the *Abyssines*, or *Armenians*, or any other society of Christians extant before *Luthers* time. And seeing this is so, thus I argue against your ground.

1. That ground which concludes indifferently for both parts of a contradiction, must needs be false and deceitful, and conclude for neither part: But this ground concludes indifferently both parts of a contradiction; *viz.* That the *Greek* Church is the Catholick Church, and not the *Roman*, as well as, That the *Roman* is the Catholick Church, and not the *Greek*: Therefore the ground is false and deceitful, seem it never so plausible.

2. I answer Secondly, that you should have taken notice of my Answer, which I then gave you; which was, that your *major*, as you then framed your Argument, but as now, your *minor* is not always true. By *one* you understand *one* in external Communion; seeing nothing hindred in my Judgment, but that one Church excommunicated by another upon an insufficient cause, might yet remain a true member of the Catholick Church; and that Church, which upon the overvaluing this cause doth excommunicate the other, though in fault, may yet remain a member of the Catholick Church: which is evident from the difference about *Easter-day* between the Church of *Rome* and the Churches of *Asia*; for which vain matter *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* excommunicated the Churches of *Asia*. And yet I believe you will not say, that either the Church excommunicating, or the Church excommunicated, ceased

ſed to be a true member of the Church Catholick. The caſe is the ſame between the *Greek* and the *Roman* Church; for though the difference between them be greater, yet it is not ſo great, as to be a ſufficient ground of excommunication: and therefore the excommunication was cauſeleſs, and conſequently *Brutum fulmen*, and not ratified or confirmed by God in Heaven; and therefore the Church of *Greece* at *Luthers* riſing might be, and was a true member of the Catholick Church.

As concerning the places of Fathers, which you alledge; I demand, 1. If I can produce you an equal, or greater number of Fathers, or more ancient than theſe, not contradicted by any that lived with them or before them, for ſome doctrin condemned by the *Roman* Church, whether you will ſubſcribe it? If not, with what face or conſcience can you make uſe of, and build your whole Faith upon the Authority of Fathers in ſome things, and reject the ſame authority in others?

2. Secondly, becauſe you urge S. *Cyprians* Authority, I deſire you to tell me, whether this Argument in his time would have concluded a neceſſity of reſting in the Judgement of the *Roman* Church, or no? If not, how ſhould it come to paſs, that it ſhould ſerve now, and not then, fit this time and not that? as if it were like an Almanack, that would not ſerve for all Meridians? If it would, why was it not urged by others upon S. *Cyprian*, or repreſented by S. *Cyprian* to himſelf for his direction, when he differed from the *Roman* Church, and all other that herein conformed unto her, touching the point of Re-baptizing Hereticks; which the *Roman* Church held unlawful and damnable, S. *Cyprian* not only lawful, but neceſſary; ſo well did he reſt in the Judgment of that Church: *Quid verba audiam, cùm facta videam*, ſays he in the Comedy? And Cardinal *Perron* tells you in his Epiſtle to *Caſaubon*, that nothing is more unreaſonable, than to draw conſequences from the words of Fathers, againſt their lively and actual practice.

The ſame may be ſaid in refutation of the places out of S. *Auſtin*; who was ſo far from concluding, from them or any

any other, a neceſſity of reſting in the Judgment of the *Roman* Church, that he himſelf, as your Authors teſtifie, lived and died in oppoſition of it; even in that main fundamental point, upon which Mr. *Lewgar* hath built the neceſſity of his departure from the Church of *England*, and embracing the Communion of the *Roman* Church, that is, The Supream Authority of that Church over other Churches, and the power of receiving Appeals from them. Mr. *Lewgar*, I know, cannot be ignorant of theſe things; and therefore I wonder, with what conſcience he can produce their words againſt us, whoſe Actions are for us.

If it be ſaid, that S. *Cyprian* and S. *Auſtin* were Schiſmaticks for doing ſo; it ſeems then Schiſmaticks may not only be members of the Church, againſt Mr. *Lewgars* main concluſion, but Canoniz'd Saints of it; or elſe S. *Auſtin* and S. *Cyprian* ſhould be raſed out of the *Roman* Kalendar.

If it be ſaid, that the point of Re-baptization was not defined in S. *Cyprians* time; I ſay that in the Judgment of the Biſhop and Church of *Rome* and their adherents, it was: For they urged it as an Original and Apoſtolick Tradition, and conſequently at leaſt of as great force as any Church definition. They excommunicated *Firmilianus* and condemned S. *Cyprian*, as a falſe Chriſt, and a falſe Apoſtle, for holding the contrary; and urged him *Tyrannico terrore* to conform his judgment to theirs, as he himſelf clearly intimates.

If it be ſaid, they differed only from the particular Church of *Rome*, and not from the *Roman* Church, taking it for the univerſal ſociety of Chriſtians in Communion with that Church: I Anſwer,

1. They know no ſuch ſenſe of the word, I am ſure never uſed it in any ſuch; which whether it had been poſſible, if the Church of *Rome* had been in their judgment to other Churches in ſpiritual matters, as the City was to other Cities and Countries in temporals, I leave it to indifferent men to judge.

2. Secondly,

2. Secondly, that they differed not only from the particular *Roman* Church, but alſo from all other Churches, that agreed with it in thoſe doctrins.

3. Thirdly, I deſire you would anſwer me directly, whether the *Roman* Church, taking it for that particular Church, be of neceſſity to be held Infallible in Faith by every *Roman* Catholick, or not. To this Queſtion I inſtantly deſire a direct anſwer without tergiverſation, that we may at length get out of the cloud, and you may ſay, *Coram, quem quæritis, adſum.* If you ſay, they are not bound to believe ſo; then it is no Article of Faith, nor no certain truth upon which men may ſafely reſt without fluctuation or fear of error: And if ſo; I demand

1. Why are all your Clergy bound to ſwear, and conſequently your Laity (if they have Communion of Faith with them) by your own grounds, bound to believe, That the *Roman* Church is the Miſtris of all other Churches? where it is evident from the relation and oppoſition of the *Roman* to other Churches, that the *Roman* Church is there taken for that particular Church.

2. Secondly, why then do you ſo often urge that miſtaken ſaying of *Iræneus, Ad hanc Eccleſiam neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam?* falſely tranſlating it, as Cardinal *Perron* in *French*, and my *L. F.* in *Engliſh*——*All Churches muſt agree with this Church*; for *convenire ad* ſignifies not to *agree with*, but to *come unto*; whereas it is evident for the aforeſaid reaſon, that the *Roman* is here taken for that particular Church.

3. Thirdly, if that particular Church be not certainly infallible, but ſubject to error in points of faith; I would know, if any diviſion of your Church ſhould happen, in which the Church of *Rome* either alone, or with ſome others ſhould take one way; the Churches of *Spain* and *France*, and many other Churches another, what direction ſhould an ignorant Catholick have then from the pretended Guide of Faith? How ſhall he know which of theſe Companies is the Church? ſeeing all other Churches diſtinguiſhed from the *Roman* may err, and ſeeing the *Roman* Church is now ſuppoſed ſubject to error, and conſequently

ly not certain to guard thoſe men, or thoſe Churches that adhere unto it from erring.

4. Fourthly, if that particular Church be not infallible in Faith, let us then ſuppoſe that *de facto* it does err in faith; ſhall we not then have an Heretical head upon a Catholick body? A head of the Church, which were no member of the Church? which ſure were a very ſtrange and heterogeneous Monſter! If to avoid theſe inconveniences you will ſay, that *Roman* Catholicks muſt of neceſſity hold that particular Church infallible in faith; I ſuppoſe it will evidently follow, that S. *Auſtin* and S. *Cyprian* (notwithſtanding thoſe ſentences you pretend out of them) were no *Roman* Catholicks; ſeeing they lived and died in the contrary belief and profeſſion. Let me ſee theſe abſurdities fairly and clearly avoided, and I will diſpute no more, but follow you whitherſoever you ſhall lead me.

3. Thirdly, I anſwer, that the places alledged are utterly impertinent to the concluſion you ſhould have proved; which was, That it was impoſſible, that two Societies of Chriſtians divided upon what cauſe ſoever in external Communion, may be in truth and in Gods account, both of them parts of the Catholick Church: whereas your teſtimonies, if we grant them all, ſay no more but this; That the Societies of Hereticks, which are ſuch as overthrow any doctrin neceſſary to ſalvation; and of Schiſmaticks, which are ſuch as ſeparate from the Churches Communion without any pretence of error in the Church or unlawfulneſs in the conditions of her Communion; I ſay, they prove only this, that ſuch Societies as theſe, are no parts of the Church: which I willingly grant of all ſuch, as are properly and formally Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; from which number I think (with S. *Auſtin*) they are to be exempted, *Qui quærunt cautâ ſollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati, cùm invenerint.* Whereas I put the caſe of ſuch two Societies, which not differing indeed in any thing neceſſary to ſalvation, do yet erroneouſly believe that the errors wherewith they charge one another, are damnable, and ſo by this opinion of mutual error, are kept on both ſides from being Hereticks.

Becauſe I deſire to bring you and others to the truth, or to be brought to it by you, I thought good for your direction in your intended Reply, to acquaint you with theſe things:

1. That I conceive the————in your diſcourſe is this. That whenſoever any two Societies of Chriſtians differ in external Communion, one of them muſt be of neceſſity Heretical or Schiſmatical. I conceive there is no ſuch neceſſity; and that the ſtories of *Victor* and the Biſhops of *Aſia*, S. *Cyprian* and Pope *Stephen* make it evident; and therefore I deſire you to produce ſome convincing argument to the contrary; and that you may the better do it, I thought good to inform you what I mean by an *Heretick*, and what by a *Schiſmatick*.

An *Heretick* therefore I conceive him, that holds an Error againſt Faith with obſtinacy. Obſtinate I conceive him, who will not change his Opinion, when his reaſons for it are ſo anſwered, that he cannot reply; and when the reaſons againſt it are ſo convincing, that he cannot anſwer them. By the Faith I underſtand all thoſe Doctrines and no more, which Chriſt taught his Apoſtles, and the Apoſtles the Church; yet I exclude not from this number the certain and evident deductions of them.

A *Schiſmatick* I account him, (and *Facundus Hermianenſis* hath taught me to do ſo) who, without any ſuppoſing of error in the conditions of a Churches Communion, divides himſelf either from the obedience of that Church to which he owes obedience; or from the Communion of that Church to which he owes Communion.

2. Another thing, which I thought fit to acquaint you with, is this: That you go upon another very falſe and deceitful ſuppoſition; *viz.* that if we will not be *Proteſtants*, preſently we muſt be *Papiſts*; if we forſake the Church of *England*, we muſt go preſently to the Church of *Rome*: Whereas if your Arguments did conclude (as they do not) that before *Luthers* time, there was ſome Church of one Denomination, which was the Catholick Church; I ſhould much rather think it were the Church of *Greece*, than the Church of *Rome*; and I believe others alſo would think

think ſo as well as I, but for that reaſon which one gives, why more men hold the Pope above a Council, than a Council above a Pope, that is, becauſe Councils give no maintenance or preferment, and the Popes do.

Think not yet, I pray, that I ſay this, as if I conceived this to be your reaſon for preferring the *Roman* Church before the *Greek*; (for I proteſt I do not) but rather, that conceiving verily you were to leave the Church of *England*, to avoid trouble you took the next Boat, and went to the Church of *Rome*, becauſe that beſpake you firſt.

You impute to me (as I hear) that the way I take is deſtructive only, and that I build nothing; which firſt, is not a fault; for Chriſtian Religion is not now to be built; but only I deſire to have the rubbiſh and impertinent Lumber taken off, which you have laid upon it, which hides the glorious ſimplicity of it from them which otherwiſe would embrace it. Remember, I pray, *Averroes* his ſaying; *Quandoquidem Chriſtiani adorant quod comedunt, ſit anima mea cum Philoſophus*; and conſider the ſwarms of Atheiſts in *Italy*, and then tell me, whether your unreaſonable and contradictious Doctrines, your forged Miracles and counterfeit Legends have not in all probability produced this effect. Secondly, if it be a fault, it is certainly your own; for your diſcourſe intended for the proof of a poſitive concluſion —— *That we muſt be Papiſts* —— proves *in deed and in truth* nothing; but even *in ſhew and appearance* no more but this Negative, that we muſt not be Proteſtants; but what we muſt be, if we muſt not be Proteſtants, God knows; you in this Diſcourſe (I am ſure) do not ſhew it.

Mr. *Lewgars* Reply.

§. 1. The minor of Mr. *Chillingworths* Argument againſt my ground is very weak, being framed upon a falſe ſuppoſition, that a Proteſtant could name no other Church profeſſing a diverſe Faith, &c. from the *Greek* Church, which was the Catholick Church: for if he could not indeed name any other, the title would remain to the *Greek* Church: But he hath the *Roman* to name, and ſo my ground cannot conclude, either for the *Greek* or *Abyſſine* or

any other, beſides the *Roman*, but for that it does, except he can name ſome other.

§. 2. His ſecond anſwer is weak likewiſe; for my Minor is always true; at leaſt they thought it to be ſo, whoſe Authorities I produce in confirmation of it, as will appear to any one that conſiders them well; how their force lies in *Theſi*, not in *Hypotheſi*; not that the Church was not then divided into more Societies than one, but that ſhe could never be.

§. 3. As for his Inſtance to the contrary, wherein he believes I will not ſay the Churches excommunicated by *Victor* ceaſed to be a true member of the Catholick: If I ſay ſo, I ſay no more than the Ancient Fathers ſaid before me. *Iræneus* when he deſired *Victor* μὴ ἀποβαλεῖν, not to cut off ſo many and great Churches; and *Ruffinus*, *reprehendit eam, quod non benè feciſſet abſcindere ab unitate corporis*, &c.

§. 4. But howſoever the caſe of Excommunication may be, the diviſion of external Communion which I intended, and the Fathers ſpake of in the alledged Authorities, was that which was made by voluntary ſeparation.

§. 5. Whereby the Church (before one Society) is divided into ſeveral diſtinct Societies, both claiming to be the Church; of which Societies ſo divided, but one can be the Catholick; and this is proved by the Authorities alledged; which Authorities muſt not be anſwered by diſproving them, as he does (for that is to change his Adverſary, and confute the Fathers ſayings, inſtead of mine) but by ſhewing their true ſenſe or judgment to be otherwiſe than I alledged it.

§. 6. To his demand upon the places alledged I Anſwer, that I do not build my whole faith of this concluſion upon the Authority of thoſe Fathers; for I produce them, not for the Authority of the thing, but of the Expoſition. The thing it ſelf is an Article of the Creed, *Unam Catholicam*; grounded in expreſs Scripture, *Columba mea unica:* but becauſe there is difference in underſtanding this Propheſie, I produce theſe Authorities, to ſhew the Judgment of the Ancient Church how they underſtood it; and the proper anſwer to this is either to ſhew, that theſe words were

were not there, or at leaſt, not this meaning; and ſo to ſhew their meaning out of other places more pregnant.

§. 7. And I promiſe, that whenſoever an equal conſent of Fathers can be ſhewed for any thing, as I can ſhew for this, I will believe it as firmly as I do this.

§. 8. But this is not the Anſwerers part, to propound doubts and difficulties, but to ſatisfie the proof objected.

§. 9. And if this courſe be any more taken, I will ſave my ſelf all farther labour in a buſineſs ſo likely to be endleſs.

§. 10. His ſecond Anſwer to the places is wholly impertinent; for therein would he diſprove them from watching a neceſſity of reſting in the judgment of the *Roman Church*; whereas I produced them only to ſhew, that among ſeveral Societies of Chriſtians, only *one* can be the *Catholick*; and againſt this his ſecond Anſwer ſaith nothing.

§. 11. In his third Anſwer he makes ſome ſhew of reply to the Authorities themſelves; but he commits a double Error: One, that he impoſes upon me a wrong concluſion to be proved, as will appear by comparing my concluſion in my Paper, with the concluſion he would appoint me.

§. 12. Another, that he impoſes upon the Authorities a wrong Interpretation, no way grounded in the words themſelves, nor in the places whence they were taken, nor in any other places of the ſame Fathers, but meerly forged out of his own Brain. For firſt, the places do not only ſay, that the Societies of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are no part of the Church; but that the Church cannot be divided into more Societies than *one*; and they account Societies divided, which are either of a diverſe Faith or a diverſe Communion. Neither do they define *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks* in that manner as he does.

§. 13. For an *Heretick* in their Language is he, that oppoſes partinaciouſly the Common Faith of the Church: and a *Schiſmatick*, he that ſeparates from the *Catholick* Communion; never making any mention at all of the cauſe.

§. 14.

§. 14. And if his definition of a *Schiſmatick* may ſtand, then certainly there was no *Schiſmatick* ever in the World, nor none are at this day: for none did, none does ſeparate without ſome pretence of Error, or unlawfulneſs in the Conditions of the Churches Communion.

§. 15. And ſo I expect both a fuller and directer anſwer to my Argument, without excurſions, or diverſions into any other matter, till the judgment of Antiquity be cleared in this point.

Mr. *Chillingworths* Anſwer.

Ad §. 1. The *Minor* of my Argument, you ſay, is very weak, being grounded upon a falſe Suppoſition, That a Proteſtant could name no other Church profeſſing a diverſe Faith from the *Greek*, which was the *Catholick* Church: And your reaſon is, becauſe he might name the *Roman*. But in earneſt, Mr. *Lewgar*, do you think that a Proteſtant remaining a Proteſtant, can eſteem the *Roman* Church to be the Catholick Church? or do you think to put tricks upon us, with taking your propoſition one while *in ſenſu compoſito*, another while *in ſenſu diviſo*? For if your meaning was, that a Proteſtant not remaining, but ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, might name the *Roman* for the *Catholick*; ſo I ſay alſo to your diſcourſe, that a Proteſtant ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, might name a *Greek* to be the *Catholick* Church; and if there were any neceſſity to find out one Church of one denomination, as the *Greek*, the *Roman*, the Abyſſine, which *one* muſt be the *Catholick*? I ſee no reaſon, but he might pitch upon the *Greek* Church, as well as the *Roman*; I am ſure your diſcourſe proves nothing to the contrary. In ſhort, thus I ſay, if a *Grecian* ſhould go about to prove to a Proteſtant, that his Church is the *Catholick*, by ſaying (as you do for the *Roman*) ſome one was ſo before *Luther*, and you can name no other, therefore ours is ſo: Whatſoever may be anſwered to him, may be anſwered to you. For as you ſay, a Proteſtant, ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, may name to him the *Roman*; ſo I ſay, a Proteſtant, ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, may name to you the *Grecian*. If

you

you ſay, a Proteſtant, remaining a Proteſtant, can name no other but the *Roman*, for the *Catholick*; I may (very ridiculouſly I confeſs, but yet as truly) ſay, he can name no other but the *Grecian*. If you ſay, he cannot name the *Greek Church* neither, remaining a Proteſtant; I ſay likewiſe, neither remaining a Proteſtant, can he name the *Roman* for the *Catholick*. So the Argument is equal in all reſpects on both ſides; and therefore either concludes for both parts (which is impoſſible, for then contradictions ſhould be both true) or elſe (which is certain) it concludes for neither. And therefore I ſay, your ground you build on, That before *Luther* ſome Church of one denomination was the *Catholick* (if it were true, as it is moſt falſe) would not prove your intent. It would deſtroy perhaps our Church, but it would not build yours. It would prove peradventure, that we muſt not be Proteſtants, but it will be far from proving that we muſt be *Papiſts*. For after we have left being Proteſtants (I tell you again that you may not miſtake) there is yet no neceſſity of being *Papiſts*; no more than if I go out of *England*, there is a neceſſity of going to *Rome*. And thus much to ſhew the poorneſs of your ground, if it were true. Now in the ſecond place, I ſay it is falſe, neither have you proved any thing to the contrary.

Ad §. 2. You ſay, the Authorities you have produced, ſhew to any that conſider them well, That the Church could never be divided into more Societies than *one*; and you mean (I hope) *one* in external Communion, or elſe you dally in ambiguities; and then I ſay, I have well conſidered the alledged authorities, and they appear to me to ſay no ſuch thing; but only, that the Societies of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are no true members of the Church: Whereas I put the caſe of two ſuch Societies, which were divided in external Communion by reaſon of ſome over-valued difference between them, and yet were neither of them Heretical or Schiſmatical. To this I know you could not anſwer, but only by ſaying, That this ſuppoſition was impoſſible; *viz.* That of two Societies divided in external Communion, neither ſhould be Heretical nor Schiſmatical;

Schiſmatical; and therefore I deſired you to prove by one convincing Argument, that this is impoſſible. This you have not done, nor I believe can do; and therefore all your places fall ſhort of your intended concluſion; and if you would put them into Syllogiſtical form, you ſhould preſently ſee you conclude from them Sophiſtically in that fallacy, which is called *A dicto ſecundum quid, ad dictum Simpliciter*. Thus, — No two divided Societies, whereof one is Heretical or Schiſmatical, can be both members of the *Catholick Church*: therefore ſimply no two divided Societies can be ſo: the Antecedent I grant, which is all that your places ſay, as you ſhall ſee anon; but the conſequence is Sophiſtical, and therefore that I deny: It is no better nor worſe than if you ſhould argue thus; No true divided Societies, whereof one is Out-lawed and in Rebellion, are both members of the ſame Commonwealth; therefore ſimply no two divided Societies.

But againſt this you pretend, That the alledged places ſay not only, that the Societies of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are no parts of the Church; but that the Church cannot be divided into more Societies than *one*: And they account Societies divided, which are either of a diverſe Faith, or of a diverſe Communion: This is that which I would have proved, but as yet I cannot ſee it done. There be Eleven Quotations in all; ſeven of them ſpeak expreſly and formally of diviſion made by Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, *viz.* 1. 3, 4. 7. 9, 10, 11. Three other of them, (*viz.* 5, 6. 8.) though they uſe not the word, yet Mr. *Lewgar* knows they ſpeak of the *Donatiſts*, which were Schiſmaticks; and that by the relative particles *you* and *them* are meant the *Donatiſts*. And laſtly, the ſecond, Mr. *Lewgar* knows, ſays nothing but this, That an Hereticks cannot be accounted of that one Flock, which is the Church.

But to make the moſt of them that can be: The firſt ſaith, the Unity of the Church cannot be ſeparated at all, nor divided. This I grant, but then I ſay, every difference does not in the ſight of God divide this Unity: for then diverſity of Opinions ſhould do it; and ſo the *Jeſuits* and

and *Dominicans* ſhould be no longer members of the ſame Church. Or if every difference will not do it, why muſt it of neceſſity be always done by difference in Communion, upon an inſufficient ground, yet miſtaken for ſufficient? (for ſuch only I ſpeak of.) Sure I am, this place ſays no ſuch matter. The next place ſaies, the Flock is but one; and all the reſt, that the Church is but *one*, and that Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are not of it; which certainly was not the thing to be proved, but that of this one Flock, of this one Church, two Societies divided without juſt cauſe in Communion, might not be true and lively members; both in one Body Myſtical in the ſight of God, though divided in Unity in the ſight of men: It is true indeed, whoſoever is ſhut out from the Church on Earth, is likewiſe cut off from it before God in Heaven: but you know it muſt be *Clave non errante*; when the cauſe of abſciſſion is true and ſufficient.

Ad §. 3. If you ſay ſo, *you ſay no more than the Fathers*: but what evaſions and tergiverſations are theſe? Why do you put us off with *ifs* and *ands*? I beſeech you tell me, or at leaſt him that deſires to reap ſome benefit by our Conference, directly and Categorically, —— Do you ſay ſo, or do you ſay, it is not ſo? Were the Excommunicated Churches of *Aſia* ſtill members of the *Catholick Church* (I mean in Gods account) or were they not? but all damned for that horrible Hereſie of celebrating the Feaſt of *Eaſter* upon a diverſe day from the Weſtern Churches? If you mean honeſtly and fairly, anſwer directly to this Queſtion, and then you ſhall ſee what will come of it. Aſſure your ſelf, you have a Wolf by the Ears: If you ſay they were, you overthrow your own concluſions, and ſay that Churches divided in Communion may both be members of the *Catholick*. If they were not; then ſhall we have Saints and Martyrs in Heaven, which were no members of the *Catholick Roman Church*.

As for *Irenæus* his μὴ συνόδευειν, and *Ruffinus* his —— *Abſcindere ab unitate corporis*; they imply no more but this at the moſt; That *Victor* (*quantum in ſe fuit*) did cut them off from the *External* Communion of the *Catholick Church*;

ſuppoſing, that for their Obſtinacy in their Tradition, they had cut themſelves off from the *internal* Communion of it: but that this ſentence of *Victors* was ratified in Heaven, and that they were indeed cut off from the myſtical Body of Chriſt, ſo far was *Irenæus* from thinking, that he, and in a manner all the other Biſhops, reprehended *Victor* for pronouncing this Sentence on them, upon a cauſe ſo inſufficient: which how they could ſay, or poſſibly think of a Sentence ratified by God in Heaven, and not reprehend God himſelf, I deſire you to inform me: and if they did not intend to reprehend the Sentence of God himſelf, together with *Victors*, then I believe it will follow unavoidably, that they did not conceive, nor believe *Victors* Sentence to be ratified by God; and conſequently did not believe, that theſe excommunicated Churches were not in Gods account true members of the Body of Chriſt.

Ad §. 4. And here again, we have another ſubterfuge, by a Verbal diſtinction between Excommunication, and voluntary ſeparation: As if the ſeparation, which the Church of *Rome* made in *Victors* time from the *Aſian Churches*, were not a voluntary ſeparation; or as if the Churches of *Aſia*, did not voluntarily do that which was the cauſe of their ſeparation; or as if (though they ſepated not themſelves indeed, conceiving the cauſe to be inſufficient) they did not yet remain voluntarily ſeparated, rather than conform themſelves to the Church of *Rome*: Or laſtly, as if the *Grecians* of Old, or the Proteſtants of Late, might not pretend as juſtly as the *Aſian* Churches, that their Separation too was not voluntarily, but of neceſſity; for that the Church of *Rome* required of them under pain of Excommunication ſuch conditions of her Communion, as were neither neceſſary nor lawful to be performed.

Ad §. 5. And here again the matter is ſtreightned by another limitation. Both ſides (ſay you) muſt claim to be the Church: but what then, if one of them only claim (though vainly) to be the Church, and the other content it ſelf with being a part of it? Theſe then it ſeems

for

(for any thing you have ſaid to the contrary) may be both members of the *Catholick Church*: And certainly this is the caſe now, between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*: and for ought I know, was between the Church of *Rome* and the Church of *Greece*: For I believe, it will hardly be proved, that the Excommunication between them was mutual; nor that the Church of *Greece* eſteems it ſelf the whole Church, and the Church of *Rome* no Church but it ſelf a ſound member of the Church, and that a corrupted one.

Again, whereas you ſay, the Fathers ſpeak of a voluntary ſeparation; certainly they ſpeak of any Separation by Hereticks; and ſuch were (in *Victors* judgment) the Churches of *Aſia*, for holding an opinion contrary to the Faith, as he eſteemed: Or if he did not, why did he cut them from the Communion of the Church? But the true difference is, The Fathers ſpeak of thoſe, which by your Church are eſteemed Hereticks, and are ſo; whereas the *Aſian* Churches were by *Victor* eſteemed Hereticks, but were not ſo.

Ad §. 6. But their Authorities produced ſhew no more, than what I have ſhewed; that the Church is but one in excluſion of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; and not that two particular Churches divided by miſtake upon ſome overvalued difference, may not be both parts of the *Catholick*.

Ad §. 7. But I deſire you to tell me, whether you will do this, if the Doctrines produced and confirmed by ſuch a conſent of Fathers, happen to be in the judgment of the Church of *Rome*, either not *Catholick*, or abſolutely Heretical. If you will undertake this, you ſhall hear farther from me: But if, when their places are produced, you will pretend (as ſome of your ſide do) that ſurely they are corrupted, having neither reaſon nor ſhew of reaſon for it; unleſs this may paſs for one (as perhaps it may, where reaſons are ſcarce) that they are againſt your Doctrine; or if you will ſay, they are to be interpreted according to the pleaſure of your Church, whether their words will bear it or no; then I ſhall but loſe my Labour;

for this is not to try your Church by the Fathers, but the Fathers by your Church.

The Doctrines which I undertake to justifie, by a greater consent of Fathers than here you produce, for instance shall be these.

1. That Gods Election supposeth prescience of mans Faith and perseverance.

2. That God doth not predetermine men to all their Actions.

3. That the *Pope* hath no power in temporalties over Kings either directly or indirectly.

4. That the Bishop of *Rome* may Err in his publick determinations of matters of Faith.

5. That the B. *Virgin* was guilty of Original sin.

6. That the B. *Virgin* was guilty of actual sin.

7. That the Communion was to be administred to the Laity in both kinds.

8. That the reading of the Scripture was to be denied to no man.

9. That the Opinion of the Millenaries is true.

10. That the Eucharist is to be administred to Infants.

11. That the substance of Bread and Wine remains in the Eucharist of her Consecration.

12. That the Souls of the Saints departed enjoy not the Vision of God before the Last day.

13. That at the day of judgment, all the Saints shall pass through a purging fire.

All these propositions are held by your Church either Heretical, or at least not *Catholical*; and yet in this promise of yours you have undertaken to believe them as firmly, as you now do this, That two divided Societies cannot be both members of the *Catholick Church*.

Ad §. 8. Is it not then the Answerers part to shew, that the proofs pretended are indeed no proofs? and doth not he prove no proofs (at least in your mouth) who undertakes to shew, that an equal or greater number of the very same witnesses is rejected by your selves in many other things? Either the consent of the Fathers, in any Age or Ages, is infallible, and then you are to reject

ject it in nothing; or it is not ſo, and then you are not to urge it in any thing: As if the Fathers Teſtimonies againſt us were Swords and Spears, and againſt you bulruſhes.

Ad §. 9. In effect as if you ſhould ſay, If you anſwer not as I pleaſe, I will diſpute no longer. But you remember the proverb, —— will think of it. —— *Occaſionem quærit, qui cupit diſcedere.*

Ad §. 10. I pray tell me, Is not *Therefore* a note of an Illation, or a concluſion? And is not your laſt *therefore this, Therefore her judgment is to be reſted in?* which though it be not your firſt concluſion, yet yours it is, and you may not declaim it: and it is ſo near of kin to the former (in your judgment I am ſure) that they muſt ſtand or fall together: therefore he that ſpeaks pertinently for the diſproving of the one, cannot ſpeak impertinently towards the diſproving the other: and therefore you cannot ſo ſhift it off, but of neceſſity you muſt anſwer the Argument there urged, or confeſs it ingenuouſly to be unanſwerable.

Or if you will not anſwer any thing, where the contradiction of your firſt concluſion is not in terms inferred, then take it thus: If S. *Cyprian* and S. *Auſtin* did not think it neceſſary in matters of Faith to reſt in the judgment of the *Roman* Church and the adherents of it; Then either they thought not the *Catholick Churches* judgment neceſſary to be reſted on, or they thought not *that* the *Catholick Church*. But the Antecedent is true, and undeniably proved ſo by their Actions, and the conſequence Evident: Therefore the conſequent muſt be true in one or other part: But you will not ſay the former is true; it remains therefore, the latter muſt be, and that is —— That S. *Auſtin* and S. *Cyprian* did not think the Church of *Rome* and the adherents of it to be the Catholick Church.

Ad §. 11. But I tell you now, and have already told you, that in our diſcourſe before Mr. *Skinner* and Dr. *Sheldon* I anſwered your Major, as then you framed your Argument, as now your Minor thus — If you underſtand by

by *one company* of Chriſtians, *one* in External Communion, I deny your Major. For I ſay, that two ſeveral Societies of Chriſtians, which do not externally communicate together, may be both parts of the ſame Catholick Church: and what difference there is between this, and the concluſion I told you, you ſhould have proved, I do not well underſtand.

Ad §. 12. And is it poſſible you ſhould ſay ſo, when every one of the places carry this ſenſe in their forehead, and 7 of the 11 in terms expreſs it —— That they intended only to exclude Hereticks and Schiſmaticks from being parts of the Church: For if they did not, againſt whom did they intend them? *Pagans* lay no claim to the Church, therefore not againſt them: *Catholicks* they did not intend to exclude: I know not who remains beſides, but Hereticks and Schiſmaticks. Beſides the frequent oppoſition in them between —— *One Church* on the one ſide, and Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; who ſees not, that in theſe places they intended to exclude only theſe pretenders out of the Churches Unity?

Laſtly, whereas you ſay, that the places ſay —— That the Church cannot be divided; and that they account thoſe divided who are of a diverſe Faith, or a diverſe Communion: I tell you, that I have read them over and over, and unleſs my Eyes deceive, they ſay not one word of a *diverſe Communion.*

Ad §. 13. Whereas a *Heretick* in your Language, is he that oppoſeth pertinaciouſly the common Faith of the Church; —— In mine —— He is ſuch a one, as holds an Error againſt Faith with Obſtinacy: Verily a monſtrous difference between theſe definitions. To oppoſe and hold againſt (I hope) are all one: *Faith* and the *common Faith of the Church,* ſure are not very different: *pertinaciouſly* and *with Obſtinacy,* methinks might paſs for Synonimous; and ſeeing the parts agree ſo well, methinks the Total ſhould not be at great hoſtility. And for the definition of a *Schiſmatick,* if you like not mine (which yet I give you out of a Father) I pray take your own; and then ſhew me, (if you mean to do any thing) that where-

ſoever

ſoever there are two Societies of Chriſtians, differing in external Communion, one of them moſt be of neceſſity either Heretical, or Schiſmatical in your own ſenſe of theſe words. To the contrary, I have ſaid already, (and ſay it now again, that you may not forget it) the *Roman* and the *Aſian* Churches in *Victors* time, the *Roman* and the *African* in S. *Stephens* time differed in external Communion; and yet neither of them was *Heretical*; For they did not oppoſe pertinaciouſly the common Faith of the Church: Neither of them was *Schiſmatical*; for they did not ſeparate (never making mention of the cauſe at all) but were ſeparated by the *Roman* Church, and that upon ſome cauſe, though it were not ſufficient.

Ad §. 14. The *Donatiſt* did ſo (as *Facundus Hermianenſis* teſtifies:) but you are abuſed, I believe, with not diſtinguiſhing between theſe two — They did pretend, that the Church required of them ſome unlawful thing among the conditions of her Communion: and they did pretend, that it was unlawful for them to communicate with the Church. This I confeſs they did pretend; but it was in regard of ſome Perſons in the Church, with whom they thought it unlawful to communicate: But the former they did not pretend, (I mean while they continued meer Schiſmaticks,) *viz.* That there was any Error in the Church, or impiety in her publick ſervice of God: And this was my meaning in ſaying, — A Schiſmatick is he, which ſeparates from the Church without pretence of Error, or unlawfulneſs in the conditions of her Communion: Yet if I had left out the term *unlawfulneſs*, the definition had been better, and not obnoxious to this Cavillation; and ſo I did in the ſecond Paper which I ſent you for your direction; which if you had dealt candidly, you ſhould have taken notice of.

Ad §. 15. I have replied (as I think) fully to every part and particle of your Argument. Neither was the Hiſtory of S. *Cyprians* and S. *Auſtins* oppoſition to the Church of *Rome* an excurſion or diverſion; but a cleer demonſtation of the contradictory of your concluſion: (*viz. That the* Roman *Church*, &c. *and therefore her judgment not to be reſted*

ſted upon) For an anſwer hereto I ſhall be very importunate with you; and therefore, if you deſire to avoid trouble, I pray come out of my debt as ſoon as may be.

If it be ſaid, that my Argument is not contradictory to your concluſion; becauſe it ſhews only, that the *Roman* Church with her adherents was not in S. *Cyprians* or S. *Auſtins* time the Catholick Church, but was at the time before *Luther*; I ſay, to conclude the one is to conclude the other. For certainly, if it were then at *Luthers* time ſo, it was always ſo; if it was not always, it was not then: for if it be of the eſſence, or neceſſary to the Church (as is pretended) to be a Society of Chriſtians joyned in Communion with the Church and Biſhop of *Rome*; then did it always agree to the Church; and therefore in S. *Cyprians* and S. *Auſtins* time, as well as at *Luthers* riſing: if it were not always, particularly not in S. *Cyprians* time, of the Eſſence or neceſſary to the Church to be ſo; then it was impoſſible the Church ſhould acquire this Eſſence, or this property afterwards, and therefore impoſſible it ſhould have it at the time of *Luthers* riſing. *Neceſſarium eſt, quod non aliquando ineſt, aliquando non ineſt, alicui ineſt, alicui non ineſt; ſed quod ſemper & omni.* Ariſt. Poſt. Analyt.

Again, every Sophiſter knows, that of Particulars nothing can be concluded; and therefore he that will ſhew, that the Church of *Rome* and the adherents of it was the Catholick Church at *Luthers* riſing; He muſt argue thus; —— It was always ſo, therefore then it was ſo: Now this Antecedent is overthrown by any Inſtance to the contrary; and ſo the firſt Antecedent being proved falſe, the firſt conſequent cannot but be falſe; for what Reaſon can be imagined, that the Church of *Rome* and the Adherents of it, was not the whole Catholick Church at S. *Cyprians* time, and was at *Luthers* riſing? If you grant (as I think you cannot deny) that a Church divided from the Communion of the *Roman*, may be ſtill in truth and in Gods account a part of the Catholick (which is the thing we ſpeak of:) then I hope Mr. *Lewgars* Argument from Unity of Communion is fallen to the ground; and it will be no good Plea to ſay,

Some

Some one Church, not conſiſting of divers Communions, was the Catholick Church at *Luthers* riſing:

No one Church can be named to be the Catholick Church, but the *Roman*:

Therefore the *Roman* Church was the Catholick at *Luthers* riſing.

For Mr. *Lewgar* hath not nor cannot prove the Major of this ſyllogiſm certainly true; but to the contrary I have proved, that it cannot be certainly true, by ſhewing divers inſtances, wherein divers divided Communions have made up the Catholick Church: and therefore not the dividing of the Communions, but the cauſe and ground of it, is to be regarded, whether it be juſt and ſufficient, or unjuſt and inſufficient.

Neither is the Biſhop or Church of *Rome*, with the Adherents of it, an infallible Judge thereof; for it is evident, both he and it have erred herein divers times; which I have evinced already by divers examples, which I will not repeat; but add to them one confeſſed by Mr. *Lewgar* himſelf in his diſcourſe upon the Article of the Catholick Church, pag. 84. *S.* Athanaſius *being excommunicated (though by the* [a] *whole Church) yet might remain a member of Chriſts body, (not viſible, for that is impoſſible,* [b] *that a perſon cut off from viſible Communion, though unjuſtly, ſhould be a viſible member of the Church, but) by inviſible Communion, by reaſon of the invalidity of the ſentence; which being unjuſt, is valid enough to viſible exciſion, but not farther.*

[a] How by the whole Church, when himſelf was part of it, and communicated ſtill with divers other parts of it?

[b] What not to them who know and believe him to be unjuſtly Excommunicated?

II. *A Diſcourſe againſt the Infallibility of the* Roman Church, *with an Anſwer to all thoſe Texts of Scripture that are alledged to prove it.*

THE Condition of Communion with the Church of *Rome*, without the performance whereof no man can be received into it, is this, That he believe firmly and without doubting, whatſoever that Church requires him to believe.

It is impoſſible that any man ſhould certainly believe any thing, unleſs that thing be either evident of it ſelf (as that twice two are four; that every whole is greater than a part of it ſelf) or unleſs he have ſome certain reaſon (at leaſt ſome ſuppoſed certain reaſon) and infallible guide for his belief thereof.

The Doctrins which the Church of *Rome* requireth to be believed are not *evident of themſelves*; for then every one would grant them at firſt hearing without any further proof. He therefore that will believe them, muſt have ſome certain and infallible ground whereupon to build his belief of them.

There is no other ground for a mans belief of them, eſpecially in many points, but only an aſſurance of the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*.

Now this point of that Churches Infallibility, is not evident of it ſelf; for then no man could chuſe but in his heart believe it without farther proof. Secondly, it were in vain to bring any proof of it, as vain as to light a Candle to ſhew men the Sun. Thirdly, it were impoſſible to bring any proof of it, ſeeing nothing can be more evident, than that which of it ſelf is evident: and nothing can be brought in proof of any thing which is not more evident than that matter to be proved: But now experience teacheth that millions there are, which have heard talk of the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, and yet do not believe that the defenders of it do not think it either vain or impoſſible to go about to prove it; and from hence it follows plainly, that this point is not evident of it ſelf.

Neither

Neither is there any other certain ground for any mans belief of it: or if there be, I deſire it may be produced, as who am ready and moſt willing to ſubmit my judgment to it, fully perſwaded that none can be produced, that will endure a ſevere and impartial examination.

If it be ſaid, The *Roman* Church is to be believed infallible becauſe the Scripture ſays it is ſo.

1. I demand how ſhall I be aſſured of the Texts that be alledged, that they are indeed Scripture, that is, the Word of God? And the anſwer to this muſt be either becauſe the Church tells me ſo, or ſome other: if any other be given, then all is not finally reſolved into, and built upon that Churches Authority; and this anſwer then I hope a Proteſtant may have leave to make uſe of, when he is put to that perillous Queſtion; *How know you the Scripture to be the Scripture?* If the anſwer be, becauſe the Church tells me ſo: my reply is ready; that to believe that Church is infallible, becauſe the Scriptures ſay ſo: and that the Scripture is the word of God, becauſe the ſame Church ſays ſo, is nothing elſe but to believe the Church is infallible, becauſe the Church ſays ſo, which is infallible.

2. I could never yet from the beginning of *Geneſis*, to the end of the *Apocalypſe*, find it written ſo much as once in expreſs terms, or equivalently, that the Church in ſubordination to the Sea of *Rome* ſhall be always infallible.

3. If it be ſaid, that this is drawn from good conſequence from Scripture truly interpreted; I demand, what certain ground have I to warrant me, that this conſequence is good and this interpretation true: and if anſwer be made, that reaſon will tell me ſo: I reply, 1. That this is to build all upon my own reaſon and private interpretation. 2. I have great reaſon to fear, that reaſon aſſures no man, that the infallibility of the Church of *Rome* may be deduced from Scripture, by good and firm conſequence.

4. If it be ſaid, that a Conſent of Fathers do ſo interpret the Scripture. I anſwer, 1. That this is moſt falſe and cannot without impudence be pretended, as I am ready to juſtifie to any indifferent Hearer. 2. I demand, who ſhall be judge whether the Fathers mean as is pretended.

If it be ſaid, reaſon will tell me ſo: I ſay, 1. this is falſe. 2. This is again to do that which is objected to Proteſtants for ſuch a horrid crime, that is, to build all finally upon reaſon.

If it be ſaid, they are ſo interpreted by the Catholick Church; I demand, whether by the Catholick Church be meant that onely that is in ſubordination to the Biſhop of *Rome*, or any other with that, or beſides that. If any other, it is falſe and impudent to pretend that they ſo underſtand the Fathers or Scriptures: If that only, then this is to ſay, that that Church is infallible, becauſe it may be deduced from Scripture that it is ſo; and to prove that it may be deduced from Scripture, becauſe the Fathers ſay ſo; and to prove the Fathers do ſay and mean ſo, becauſe the Church of *Rome* ſays they do ſo. And then what a ſtir and trouble was here to no purpoſe; why was it not rather ſaid plainly at the beginning; The Church of *Rome* is certainly infallible, becauſe ſhe her ſelf ſays ſo; and ſhe muſt ſay true becauſe ſhe is infallible: and that is as much to ſay as unleſs you grant me the Queſtion, I neither can nor will diſpute with you.

If it is ſaid, indeed the Fathers do not draw this doctrin from Scripture, but yet they affirm it with a full conſent, as a matter of Tradition. I reply. 1. That this pretence alſo is falſe, and that upon tryal it will not appear to have any colour of probability to any who remembers, that it is the preſent *Roman* Church, and not the Catholick Church whoſe infallibility is here diſputed. 2. I demand, who ſhall be judge, whether the Fathers do indeed affirm this or no: If reaſon, then again we are fallen upon that dangerous Rock, that all muſt be reſolved into private reaſon: If the Church I ask again, what Church is meant? If the Church of the *Grecians* or *Abyſſines* or Proteſtants, or any other but the *Roman*, it is evident they deny it. If the Church of *Rome*, then we are again very near the head of the Circle. For I ask, how ſhall I be aſſured this Church will not err and deceive me in interpreting the Fathers; and the Anſwer muſt be either none, or this, that the Church is infallible.

Obj.

Obj. If it be ſaid, that the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church would yield the Church ſo many commodities, and that the want of an infallible Church to guide men in the way to Heaven, would bring ſo many miſchiefs upon the world, that it cannot be thought but that God out of his love to men, hath appointed this Church as an infallible guide to all other Churches; ſeeing it is ſo neceſſary there ſhould be ſome ſuch guide, and ſo evident there is no other.

Anſ. I anſwer, that this argument would ſerve the Church of *Greece*, or *England*, or *Geneva*, to prove it ſelf infallible, and the guide of all other Churches, would they but take upon them to be ſo. For every one might ſay for it ſelf; It is neceſſary there ſhould be ſome Guide; it is evident there is no other; *Ergo* I am appointed by God to be that Guide. The ſame argument any man might uſe, to make himſelf Monarch of any popular State: for firſt he might repreſent unto them the commodities of a Monarchy, and the miſchiefs of a Democracy: then he might ſay, That God ſurely out of his Love to them hath appointed ſome remedy for their inconveniences: And laſtly, that he hath ordained no other to redreſs them but himſelf, and then conclude, that he alone muſt of neceſſity be the man appointed to rule over them.

I anſwer Secondly, that here alſo we muſt reſolve all into Reaſon and the private Spirit, or that we are ſtill in the Circle. For I demand, how do you know that theſe pretended commodities are to be compaſſed, and theſe pretended miſchiefs are to be avoided, only by the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome* or ſome other Church, and not by any other means which God hath provided. If you ſay, reaſon tells you ſo; I ſay 1. This is to make reaſon your laſt and loweſt foundation. 2. I aſſure you Reaſon tells me no ſuch matter, and yet I know that I am as willing to hear it as you are. If you ſay, the Church tells you ſo, and ſhe is infallible; this, I ſay, is to prove the Church infallible becauſe ſhe is ſo.

Thirdly, I demand, How it is poſſible you ſhould know, that theſe pretended commodities might not be gained, and

and theſe miſchiefs which you fear avoided, without any aſſiſtance of the Church of *Rome*'s infallibility, if all men in the world did believe the Scripture, and live according to it, and would require no more of others, but to do ſo? If you ſay, that notwithſtanding this, there would be no unity in Doctrin: I anſwer 1. It is impoſſible you ſhould know this; conſidering that there are many places in Scripture, which do more than problably import, that the want of piety in living, is the cauſe of want of unity in believing. 2. That there would be unity of Opinion in all things neceſſary: and that in things not neceſſary unity of Opinion is not neceſſary. But laſtly, that notwithſtanding differences in theſe things of leſſer importance, there might and would be unity of Communion, unity of charity and affection, which is one of the greateſt bleſſings which the world is capable of; abſolute unity of opinion being a matter rather to be deſired than hoped for.

Obj. Againſt this it has been objected, that the Scripture cannot be the guide, becauſe many men have uſed their beſt endeavors to follow it, and yet have fallen, ſome into *Arianiſm*, others into *Pelagianiſm*, others into other damnable Hereſies, and how can I ſecure any man, but he may do the like?

Anſ. To this I anſwer, by diſtinguiſhing the perſons which are pretended to have made uſe of this Guide, and yet to have fallen into Hereſie, that they were either ſuch as did love the truth ſincerely and above all things, as did ſeek it diligently and with all their power, to this intent that they might conform their belief and life unto it; ſuch as following S. *Pauls* direction, did firſt try all things deliberately, and then choſe what in their conſcience they thought was beſt: or they were ſuch as for want of the love of the truth, God ſuffered to fall into ſtrong deluſions, to fall to a falſe Religion, becauſe they brought not forth the fruits of the true; to make ſhipwreck of their faith, becauſe they had caſt away a good conſcience; to have their Eyes blinded, and their light taken away, becauſe they made not the right uſe of it, but were idle and

un-

unprofitable, and ſet their hearts upon vanity, and had only a form of Religion, but denied the effect of it in their lives and converſations; in a word, ſuch as were betrayed to their Error, and kept for ever in it, either by negligence in ſeeking the Truth, or unwillingneſs to find it, or by ſome other voluntary ſin: And for theſe I dare not flatter them with hope of pardon; but let me tell you, it is not the error of the underſtanding, but the ſin of their will that truly and properly damns them: But for the former I am confident, that nothing is more contumelious to the goodneſs of God, than to think that he will damn any ſuch; for he ſhould damn men that truly love him, and deſire to ſerve him, for doing that which all things conſidered, was impoſſible for them not to do.

Obj. If it is ſaid, that pride of their own underſtanding made them not ſubmit to the Church of *Rome*, and to her guidance, and that for this, being a voluntary ſin, they may be juſtly damned.

Anſ. I anſwer, that whether the Church of *Rome* be the guide of all men is the Queſtion, and therefore not to be begged but proved: that the man we ſpeak of is very willing to follow this Guide, could he find any good ground to believe it is his Guide; and therefore the reaſon he follows her not, is not pride but ignorance: that as it is humility to obey thoſe whom God hath ſet over us, ſo it is credulity to follow every one that will take upon him to lead us: that if the *blind lead the blind*, not only the *leader* but the *follower* ſhall periſh: Laſtly, that the preſent Church of *Rome* pretends very little and indeed nothing of moment, to get the office of being Head and Guide of the Church, which Antichriſt when he cometh, may not and will not make uſe of, for the very ſame end and purpoſe; and therefore he had reaſon, not to be too ſudden and precipitate, in committing himſelf to the conduct of the Pope, for fear of miſtaking Antichriſt for the Vicar of Chriſt.

Obj. But in all Commonwealths, it is neceſſary there ſhould be not only a Law for men to live by, but alſo a living and ſpeaking Judge to decide their differences ariſing about

about the various Interpretations of the Law, and otherwiſe Controverſies would be endleſs: therefore if ſuch a judge be ſo neceſſary in civil affairs, for the procuring and preſerving our temporal peace and happineſs; how much more neceſſary is he, for the deciding of thoſe Controverſies, that concern the ſaving and damning of our ſouls for ever.

Anſ. Hereunto I anſwer, 1. That if it were as evident and certain that God hath appointed the Pope or Church of *Rome* to be the Guide of Faith, and Judge of Controverſies, as that the King hath appointed ſuch a one to be Lord Chief Juſtice, the having of ſuch a Guide would be very available, for to preſerve the Church in Unity, and to conduct mens ſouls to Heaven: but a Judge that has no better title or evidence to his place, than the Pope has to that which he pretends to, a Judge that is doubtful and juſtly queſtionable whether he be the Judge or no, is in all probability likely to produce clean contrary effects, and to be himſelf one of the Apples of ſtrife, one of the greateſt ſubjects of Controverſie, and occaſion of diſſentions.

And to avoid this great inconvenience, if God had intended the Pope or Church of *Rome* for this great Office, certainly he would have ſaid ſo very plainly and very frequently; if not frequently, certainly ſometimes, once at leaſt he would have ſaid ſo in expreſs terms: but he does not ſay ſo, no not ſo much as once, nor any thing from whence it may be collected, with any ſure or firm conſequence: therefore if it be not certain, certainly it is very probable he never meant ſo.

Again, in Civil Controverſies the caſe can hardly be ſo put, that there ſhould be any neceſſity that the ſame man ſhould be Judge and Party: but in matters of Religion, wherein all have equal intereſt, every man is a party, and engaged to judge for temporal reſpects, this way or that way, and therefore not fit to be a Judge. But what then if he which was with ſo much clamor and ſo little reaſon vouched, for the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, do tell you plainly, there is no living Judge on Earth appointed by God, to decide the Controverſies ariſing amongſt Chriſtians;

Chriſtians; nor no way to determine them but Scripture. His words are expreſs and formal, and need no other commentary but a true interpretation.

Optatus Melevit. *lib.* 5. ad princip.

Vos dicitis, Licet; *nos, non* Licet: *inter Veſtrum* Licet, *& noſtrum* non Licet, *nutant & remigant animæ populorum. Nemo vobis credat, nemo nobis; omnes contentioſi homines ſumus. Quærendi ſunt judices: ſi Chriſtiani, de utrâque parte dari non poſſunt: de foris quærendus eſt Judex. Si* Paganus, *non poteſt noſſe Chriſtiana Secreta: Si* Judæus, *inimicus eſt Chriſtiani Baptiſmatis. Ergo in terris de hac re nullum poterit reperiri judicium: de cœlo quærendus eſt Judex. Sed ut quid pulſamus cœlum, cum habeamus hic in Evangelio Teſtamentum? Quia hoc loco rectè poſſunt terrenæ cœleſtibus comparari; tale eſt, quod quivis hominum habens numeroſos filios: His, quamdiu preſens eſt, ipſe imperat ſingulis; non eſt adhuc neceſſarium Teſtamentum. Sic & Chriſtus, quamdiu præſens in terris fuit (quamvis nec modo deſit) pro tempore quicquid neceſſarium erat, Apoſtolis imperavit. Sed quomodo terrenus pater cùm ſe in confinio ſenſerit mortis, timens ne poſt mortem ſuam ruptâ pace litigent fratres, adhibitis teſtibus voluntatem ſuam de pectore morituro transfert in tabulas diù duraturas; & ſi fuerit inter fratres contentio nata, non itur ad tumulum, ſed quæritur Teſtamentum, & qui in tumulo quieſcit, tacitis de tabulis loquitur vivus. Is, cujus eſt teſtamentum, in cœlo eſt: Ergo voluntas ejus velut in Teſtamento ſic in Evangelio inquiratur.*

That is, "You ſay ſuch a thing is *Lawful*; we ſay it is "*Unlawful*: the minds of the People are doubtful and "wavering between your *lawful* and our *unlawful*. Let "no man believe either *you* or *us*; we are all contentious "men. We muſt ſeek therefore for Judges between us. "If Chriſtians are to be our Judges; both ſides will not af- "ford ſuch. We muſt ſeek for a Judge abroad. If he be "a *Pagan*, he cannot know the ſecrets of Chriſtianity: "If he be a *Jew*, he is an Enemy to Chriſtian Baptiſm. "Therefore there is no judgment of this matter can be "found on Earth. We muſt ſeek for a Judge from Hea-

"ven. But to what end do we ſollicite Heaven, when "we have here in the Goſpel a Will and Teſtament? And "becauſe here we may fitly compare Earthly things with "Heavenly; The caſe is juſt as if a man had many Sons: "while he is preſent with them, he commands every one "what he will have done; and there is no need as yet of "making his laſt Will. So alſo Chriſt, as long as he was "preſent on Earth (though neither now is he wanting) "for a time commanded his Apoſtles, whatſoever was "neceſſary. But juſt as an Earthly Father, when he "feels his Death approaching, fearing leſt after his Death "the Brothers ſhould fall out and quarrel, he calls in Wit-"neſſes, and tranſlates his Will from his dying Heart into "Writing-Tables that will continue long after him: Now "if any controverſie ariſes among the Brothers; they do "not go to his Tomb, but conſult his laſt Will; and thus "he whilſt he reſts in his Grave, does ſpeak to them in thoſe "ſilent Tables as if he were alive. He whoſe Teſta-"ment we have, is in Heaven. Therefore we are to en-"quire his pleaſure in the Goſpel, as in his laſt Will and "Teſtament.

It is plain from hence, that he knew not of any living, ſpeaking, audible Judge, furniſhed with Authority and infallibility to decide this controverſie: had he known any ſuch aſſiſted with the Spirit of God for this purpoſe, it had been horrible impiety againſt God and the Churches peace, to ſay there was none ſuch: or the Spirit of God was not able by his aſſiſtance to keep this Judge from being hindred with partiality, from ſeeing the Truth. Had he thought the Biſhop of *Romes* ſpeaking *ex Cathedra* to be this Judge, now had been the time to have ſaid ſo: but he ſays directly the contrary, and therefore it is plain, he knew of no ſuch Authority he had.

Neither is there the like reaſon for a Judge finally and with Authority to determine controverſies in Religion and civil differences: For if the controverſie be about *Mine* and *Thine*, about Land or Money or any other thing, it is impoſſible that both I ſhould hold the poſſeſſion of it and my adverſary too: and one of us muſt do injury

to

to the other, which is not fit it ſhould be Eternal: But in matters of Doctrine the caſe is clean contrary; I may hold my opinion and do my Adverſary no wrong, and my Adverſary may hold his and do me none.

[*Texts of Scripture alledged for Infallibility.*]

The Texts alledged for it by *Cardinal Perron* and Mr. *Stratford*, are partly Prophecies of the *Old Teſtament*, partly promiſes of the *New*.

1. Eſa. 1. 26. *Thou ſhalt be called the City of Juſtice, the faithful City.*

2. Eſa. 52. 1. *Through thee ſhall no more paſs any that is uncircumciſed, or unclean.*

3. Eſa. 59. 21. *As for me, this is my Covenant with them, ſaith the Lord, my ſpirit that is upon thee, and my Words which I have put in thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeed, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeeds ſeed, ſaith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*

4. Eſa. 62. 6. *Upon thy Walls* Hieruſalem *I have appointed Watchmen all the day and all the night for ever, they ſhall not hold their peace.*

5. Jerem. 31. 33. *This ſhall be the Covenant which I will make with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *ſaith the Lord, I will give my Law in their Bowels, and in their Heart I will write it, and I will be their God, and they ſhall be my People.*

6. Ezek. 36. 27. *I will put my Spirit within you, and cauſe you to walk in my Statutes, and ye ſhall keep my judgments and do them.*

7. Ezek. 37. 26. *I will give my Sanctification in the midſt of them for ever.*

8. Oſe. 2. 19, 20. *I will diſpouſe thee to me for ever; and I will diſpouſe thee to me in Juſtice and judgment, and in mercy and commiſeration; I will Eſpouſe thee to me in Faith, and thou ſhalt know that I am the Lord.*

9. Cant. 4. 7. *Thou art all fair my Love, and there is no ſpot in thee.*

Now before we proceed farther, let us reflect upon theſe places, and make the moſt of them for the behoof

of the *Roman* Church; and I believe it will then appear to any one not veil'd with prejudice, that not one of them reaches home to the concluſion intended, which is, That the *Roman* Church is infallible.

The firſt place perhaps would do ſomething, but that there are Three main exceptions againſt it. 1. That here is no evidence, not ſo much as that of probability, that this is here ſpoken of the Church of *Rome*. 2. That it is certain that it is not ſpoken of the Church of *Rome*; but of the Nation of the *Jews*, after their converſion, as is apparent from that which follows. *Zion ſhall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteouſneſs.* 3. That it is no way certain, that whatſoever Society may be called, *the City of righteouſneſs, the faithful City*, muſt be infallible in all her Doctrine: with a great deal more probability, it might challenge from hence the privileg of being *Impeccable*; which yet *Roman Catholicks* I believe do not pretend to.

The Second place is liable to the ſame exceptions; the Church of *Rome* is not ſpoken of in it: but *Zion* and *Hieruſalem*; and it will *ſerve as well nay* better to prove *Impeccability* than *Infallibility*.

The third place is the *Achilles* for this opinion, wherein every writer Triumphs; but I wonder they ſhould do ſo; conſidering the Covenant here ſpoken of is made, not with the Church of *Rome*, but with *Zion* and them that turn from tranſgreſſion in *Jacob*, the words are: *And the Redeemer ſhall come out of* Zion, *and unto them that turn from tranſgreſſion in* Jacob *ſaith the Lord. As for me, this is my Covenant with them ſaith the Lord*; *My Spirit that is in thee and my Words*, &c. Now if the Church of *Rome* be *Zion* and they that turn from iniquity in *Jacob*, they may have Title to this Covenant; if not they muſt forbear, and leave it to the *Jews* after their Converſion; to whom it is appropriated by a more Infallible Interpreter than the *Pope*; I mean S. *Paul*, Rom. 11. 26. And it ſeems the Church of *Rome* alſo believes as much: for otherwiſe why does ſhe in the Margent of her Bible, ſend us to that place of S. *Paul* for an expoſition.

Read

Read the 4th place, and you ſhall find nothing can be made of it but this: that the Watchmen of *Hieruſalem* ſhall never ceaſe importuning God, for the ſending of the *Meſſias*: To this purpoſe ſpeaks the Prophet in *ver.* 1. *For* Zions *ſake I will not hold my peace,* and for *Hieruſalems ſake I well not reſt, until the righteouſneſs thereof go forth as brightneſs*: And the *Gentiles ſhall ſee thy righteouſneſs.* But the words following theſe that are objected, make it moſt evident, which are, *ye that make mention of the Lord keep not ſilence, and give him no reſt, till he eſtabliſh and till he make* Hieruſalem *a praiſe in the Earth.*

The 5th place had they ſet down entirely, for very ſhame they could not have urged it for the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church. The words are, *Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, that I will make a new Covenant with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *and with the Houſe of* Judah; *not according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers* —— *But this ſhall be the Covenant that I will make with the Houſe of* Iſrael —— *After thoſe days, ſaith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts and write it in their Hearts, and I will be their God and they ſhall be my People; and they ſhall teach no more every man his Neighbour and every man his Brother, ſaying, know the Lord; for they ſhall all know me from the leaſt of them to the greateſt of them, ſaith the Lord.* And now I have tranſcribed the place, I think it ſuperfluous to make any other anſwer.

The ſame Anſwer and no other will I make alſo to the 6th place. The words are. *Therefore ſay unto the Houſe of* Iſrael; *thus ſaith the Lord God, I do not this for your ſakes O Houſe of* Iſrael, *but for my holy names ſake,* ver. 22. *I will take you from among the Heathen, and gather you out of all Countries, and will bring you into your own Land,* v. 24. *Then will I ſprinkle clean Water upon you,* ver. 25. *A new heart alſo will I give you,* ver. 26. *And I will put my Spirit in you and cauſe you to walk in my Statutes, and ye ſhall keep my judgments and do them,* ver. 27. *And ye ſhall dwell in the Land that I gave to your Fathers: I will alſo ſave you from all your uncleanneſſes, and I will call for the Corn and will encreaſe it, and lay no Famine upon you. And the deſolate Land*

ſhall

ſhall be tilled, ver. 34. *And they ſhall ſay, this Land that was deſolate, is become like the Garden of* Eden.

The 7th place alſo carries its anſwer in its forehead: *Thus ſaith the Lord God, behold I will take the Children of* Iſrael *from among the* Heathen *whether they be gone; and I will make them one Nation in the Land upon the mountains of* Iſrael: *and one King ſhall be King to them all*, &c. to the end of the Chapter. In all which place, he that can find a Syllable of the Church of *Rome*, he muſt have better eyes than I have.

The next (8th) place would be very pregnant for the Church of *Rome*, if of courteſie we would grant, that whatſoever is promiſed to *Iſrael*, is intended to them. As you may ſee in the place at large, from *ver.* 17. to the end of the Chapter.

The 9th and laſt place out of the *Canticles*, had it been urged by a Proteſtant; it would have been thought a ſufficient Anſwer to have ſaid, That Myſtical Texts are not fit to argue upon; but if this will not ſerve, then we anſwer. 1. That there is no mention nor intimation of the Church of *Rome*. 2. That it proves either too much or nothing at all: that is, that the *Roman* Church is impeccable, as well as infallible; unleſs we will ſay that Errors only are Spots, and impieties are not.

Out of the New Teſtament *they alledge theſe Texts.*

Matth. 16. 18. *Upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.*

But this is ſaid of the Catholick, not of the *Roman* Church: nor can it ever be proved that the Church in Communion with the See of *Rome* is the Catholick Church. Secondly, it ſays ſomething for the *perpetuity* of the Church, but not for the *Infallibility* of it: unleſs you will take for granted what can never be proved, That a Church that teaches any Erroneous Doctrine, is a Church no longer; which is all one, as if you ſhould ſay, a man that has the *Stone*, or *Gout*, or any other Diſeaſe, is not a man.

They

They urge, Matth. 28. 19, 20.

And I am with you all days, even unto the conſummation of the World.

And here alſo if we will grant, 1. That by *you,* is meant you and only you of the Church of *Rome.* 2. That our Saviour has here obliged himſelf to aſſiſt, not only *Sufficienter,* but alſo *irreſiſtibiliter,* not only to preſerve in the Church a light of ſufficient direction, as he provided a Star for the Wiſe Men, and a Pillar of Fire and a cloud for the conduct of the *Iſraelites*; but alſo compel or at leaſt neceſſitate them to follow it. 3. That he will be with them, not only to keep them from all damnable and deſtructive Errors, but abſolutely form all erroneous Doctrines: If theſe things I ſay were granted, ſome good might be done. But certainly theſe are μεγάλα λίαν αἰτήματα, too great favours to be lookt for by ſtrangers: And yet if all this be granted, we ſhould run into this inconvenience on the other ſide; that if the promiſe be abſolute, not only the whole Church of *Rome*; not only a general Council; not the *Pope* alone; but every Biſhop, every Prieſt, every one who is ſent by Chriſt to Baptize and Preach the Goſpel, might claim this aſſiſtance by vertue of Chriſts words, and conſequently *Infallibility.*

They urge, Matth. 18. 17.

If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the Heathen *and the* Publican. And here again the Church muſt be the Church of *Rome,* or we are as far to ſeek as ever. But what if by it be meant, which is moſt evident out of the place, every particular Church of Chriſtians, whereunto any one Chriſtian injured by another, may addreſs himſelf for remedy. Certainly whoſoever reads the place without prejudice, I am confident that he ſhall not deny, but that the ſenſe of the Words is. That if any Chriſtian injure another, and being firſt admoniſhed of it by him in private; then by him before two or three

three Witneſſes; Laſtly, by the Church he lives in; and yet ſtill proceeds on obſtinately in doing injury to his Brother, he is to be eſteemed as a *Heathen*, or a *Publican*: and then if Infallibility may be concluded, what a multitude of Infallible Churches ſhall we have?

They urge, Matth. 18. 20.

Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.

But this alſo either ſhoots ſhort, or over; either proves nothing, or too much: Either it proves not the Infallibility of the whole Church, or it proves the Infallibility of every part of it: Either not the Infallibility of General Councils, or the infallibility of particular Councils; for there two or three at leaſt are aſſembled in Chriſts name. But then beſides theſe two or three for ought I can ſee or gather from the Text, they may as well be of any other Church as the *Roman*.

They urge, Luke 10. 16.

He that heareth you heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you deſpiſeth me.

But this will not do you any ſervice, unleſs of favour we grant, that *you* here, is *you* of the Church of *Rome*; and but very little if that be granted: for then every Biſhop, every Prieſt muſt be Infallible. For there is not the meaneſt of the Meſſengers of Chriſt, but this may be verified of him, That he that heareth him, heareth Chriſt, and he that deſpiſeth him, deſpiſeth Chriſt.

They urge out of John 14. *ver.* 15, 16.

I will ask my Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth.

But here alſo, what warrant have we, by *you* to underſtand the Church of *Rome*: whereas he that compares *v.* 26. with

with this, ſhall eaſily perceive, that our Saviour ſpeaks only of the Apoſtles in their own perſons; for there he ſays going on in the ſame diſcourſe. *The Holy Ghoſt whom the Father will ſend in my name, he ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatſoever I have ſaid to you:* which cannot agree but to the Apoſtles themſelves in perſon; and not to their Succeſſors, who had not yet been taught and therefore not forgotten any thing, and therefore could not have them brought to their remembrance. But what if it had been promiſed to them and their Succeſſors? had they no Succeſſors but them of the *Roman* Church? this indeed is pretended and cried up, but for proofs of it, *deſiderantur.*

Again, I would fain know whether there be any certainty, that every Pope is a good Chriſtian, or whether he may not be in the ſence of the Scripture, *of the World?* If not, how was it that *Bellarmine* ſhould have cauſe to think, that ſuch a rank of them went ſucceſſively to the Devil?

III. *A Conference, concerning the Infallibility of the* Roman *Church: Proving that the preſent Church of* Rome *either errs in her worſhipping the Bleſſed Virgin* Mary, *or that the Ancient Church did err in condemning the* Collyridians *as* Hereticks.

1. *Demand.* WHether the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, be not the foundation of their Faith which are members of that Church?

Anſw. The Infallibility of the Church is (not the foundation but) a part of their Faith who are members of the Church. And the *Roman* Church is held to be the Church, by all thoſe who are members of it.

Reply. That which is the laſt Reaſon, why you believe the Scripture to be the written Word of God and unwritten Traditions his unwritten word; and this or that to be the true ſenſe of Scripture, that is to you the foundation of your Faith, and ſuch unto you is the Infallible Authority of the *Roman* Church. Therefore unto you it is not only a part of your faith, but alſo ſuch a part as is the foundation of all other parts. Therefore you are deceived if you think, there is any more oppoſition between being a part of the faith and the foundation of other parts of it; than there is between being a part of a houſe and the foundation of it. But whether you will have it the foundation of your faith, or only a part of it, for the preſent purpoſe it is all one.

2. *Demand.* Whether the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church be not abſolutely overthrown, by proving the *preſent Roman* Church is in error, or that the *Ancient* was?

Anſw. It is, if the Error be in thoſe things wherein ſhe is affirmed to be infallible; *viz.* in points of Faith.

Reply. And this here ſpoken of, whether it be lawful to offer Tapers and Incenſe to the honour of the Bleſſed Virgin, is I hope a Queſtion concerning a point of Faith.

3. *Demand.* Whether offering a Cake to the Virgin *Mary*, be not as lawful, as to offer Incenſe and Tapers and divers other oblations to the ſame Virgin?

Anſw. It is as lawful to offer a Cake to her honour as Wax-Tapers, but neither the one, nor the other may be offered to her, or her honour, as the term or object of the Action. For to ſpeak properly, nothing is offered to her or to her honour, but to God in the honour of the Bleſſed Virgin. For Incenſe, it is a foul ſlander that it is offered any way to the Bleſſed Virgin; for that incenſing which is uſed in the time of Maſs, is ever underſtood by all ſorts of people to be directed to God only.

Reply. If any thing be offered to her, ſhe is the Object of that oblation; as if I ſee water, and through water ſomething elſe, the water is the object of my ſight, though not the laſt object. If I honour the Kings Deputy, and by him the King, the Deputy is the object of my action, though not the final object: And to ſay theſe things may be

be offered to her, but not as to the object of the action, is to ſay they may be offered to her, but not to her. For what elſe is meant by the object of an action, but that thing on which the action is imployed, and to which it is directed?

If you ſay, that by the object of the action, you mean the final object only wherewith the action is terminated; you ſhould then have ſpoken more properly and diſtinctly, and not have denied her ſimply to be the object of this action, when you mean only ſhe is not ſuch a kind of object: no more than you may deny a man to be a living creature, meaning only that he is not a horſe.

Secondly, I ſay, it is not required of *Roman* Catholicks when they offer Tapers to the Saints, that by an actual intention they direct their action actually to God; but it is held ſufficient, that they know and believe that the Saints are in Subordination and near Relation to God, and that they give this honour to the Saints becauſe of this relation: And to God himſelf rather habitually and interpretative, than actually, expreſly and formally. As many men honour the Kings Deputy, without having any preſent thought of the King, and yet their action may be interpreted an honour to the King, being given to his Deputy, only becauſe he is his Deputy, and for his relation to the King.

Thirdly, I ſay, there is no reaſon or ground in the world, for any man to think, that the *Collyridians* did not chuſe the Virgin *Mary* for the object of their worſhip, rather than any other Woman or any other Creature, meerly for her relation to Chriſt; and by conſequence there is no ground to imagine, but that at leaſt habitually and interpretative, they directed their action unto Chriſt, if not actually and formally. And *Ergo*, if that be a ſufficient defence for the Papiſts, that they make not the Bleſſed Virgin the final object of their worſhip, but worſhip her not for her own ſake, but for her relation unto Chriſt: *Epiphanius* ſurely did ill to charge the *Collyridians* with Hereſie, having nothing to impute to them, but only that he was informed, that they offered a Cake to the honour of the Bleſſed Virgin, which honour yet they might, and without queſtion did give unto her for her relation unto Chriſt,

and ſo made her not the laſt object and term of their worſhip: and from hence it is evident, that he conceived the very action it ſelf, ſubſtantially and intrinſically malitious, *i. e.* he believed it a ſin that they offered to her at all: and ſo by their action put her in the place of God, by giving unto her this worſhip proper to God; and not that they terminated their action finally in her, or did in very deed think her to be a God, and not a Creature.

But to ſpeak properly, you ſay, *nothing is offered to her or to her honour, but to God in honour of the Bleſſed Virgin.*

Belike then if through *Henly* I go from hence to *London*, I may not be ſaid properly to go to *Henly*, but only to *London:* or if through Water I ſee the Sand, I may not be properly ſaid to ſee the Water, but only the Sand. Away with ſuch ſhifting Sophiſtry; either leave your practice of offering to Saints if it be naught, or colour it not over with ſuch empty diſtinctions if it be good: Chriſt ſaith to his Apoſtles in regard of their relation to him, *He that heareth you heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you deſpiſeth me:* and yet who doubts, but they that heard the Apoſtles did properly hear them, and they that deſpiſed them did properly deſpiſe them, though their action ſtaid not in them, but reached up to Heaven and to Chriſt himſelf. You pray to Saints and Angels, though you do not terminate your prayers in them; and yet I doubt not but your prayers to Saints, may be as properly called prayers, as thoſe you make to God himſelf. For though theſe be of a more excellent nature than they, yet do they agree in the general nature, that they are both prayers. As though a Man be a more excellent living creature than a horſe, yet he agrees with him in this, that both are living creatures. But if nothing be properly offered to her or to her honor, why do you in your ſixth Anſwer ſay, you may offer any thing to the Virgin *Mary*, by way of preſents and gifts by the doctrin of the *Roman* Church? Certainly he that offers by way of gift or preſent, offers as properly as he that offers by way of ſacrifice; as a horſe is as properly a living creature as a Man.

But

But if it were ſo as you ſay (which is moſt falſe) that you did not properly offer to the Bleſſed Virgin, but to God in honour of her; yet in my judgment, this would not qualifie or mend the matter but make it worſe. For firſt, who taught you, that in the time of the Goſpel (after the accompliſhment of the prediction, *ſacrifice and offering thou wouldeſt not but a body haſt thou prepared me:* after this Interpretation of it in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, *He taketh away the firſt that he may eſtabliſh the ſecond*) that it is ſtill lawful to offer Tapers or Incenſe to God. Secondly, in my underſtanding, to offer to God in honour of the Virgin, is more derogatory from Gods honour, than to offer to her in the honour of God. For this is in my apprehenſion to ſubordinate God to her, to make her the terminating and final object of the action; to make God the way and her the end, and by and through God to conveigh the worſhip unto her.

But for incenſe, you ſay, *it is a foul ſlander, that it is offered any way to the Bleſſed Virgin.*

To this I anſwer, that your imputing ſlander to me, is it ſelf a ſlander: For 1. In your 5th Anſwer, you have given a clear intimation that you have never been out of *England*: ſo that you cannot certainly know, what is the practice of your Church in this point beyond Sea. And he that lives amongſt you, and has but half an Eye open and free from prejudice, cannot but ſee, that the *Roman* Religion is much more exorbitant in the general practice of it, than it is in the Doctrine publiſhed in Books of Controverſie; where it is delivered with much caution and moderation, nay cunning and diſſimulation that it may be the fitter to win and engage Proſelytes; who being once enſnared, though they be afterwards ſtartled with ſtrange and unlookt-for practices, yet a hundred to one, but they will rather ſtifle their Conſcience, and daſh all ſcruples againſt the pretended Rock of their Churches Infallibility, and blindly follow thoſe guides, to whoſe Conduct they have unadviſedly committed themſelves, than come off again with the ſhame of being reputed weak and inconſtant: ſo terrible an Idol is this vain nothing, *the opinion and cenſure of fooliſh men.* But

But to return again to you, I ſay your ignorance of the practice of the *Roman* Church beyond the Seas, does plainly convince that you have raſhly and therefore ſlanderouſly charged me with the Crime of ſlander. As for your reaſon you add, conſider it again, and you will ſee it is worth nothing. For what if incenſing in time of Maſs, be underſtood by all ſorts of People to be directed to God alone (which yet you cannot poſſibly know) yet this I hope hinders not, but that in Proceſſions, you may Incenſe the Images of the Saints, and conſequently (according to your Doctrine) do this Honour to the Saints themſelves repreſented by the Images. I my ſelf (unleſs I am very much miſtaken) was preſent when this very thing was done to the Picture of Saint *Benet* or Saint *Gregory* in the Cloyſter of Saint *Vedaſtus* in the Monaſtery in *Doway*.

But indeed what a ridiculous inconſequence is it, to think that Wax Tapers may lawfully be offered to the Saints and incenſe may not: or if Incenſe may not, which you ſeem to diſclaim as impious, that Wax Tapers may.

4. *Demand.* Whether the *Collyridians* were not condemned as Hereticks by the Ancient Church. Firſt, for offering a Cake upon a Anniverſary Feaſt to the Bleſſed Virgin. Secondly for that they did this not being Prieſts.

Anſw. The *Collyridians* were condemned as Hereticks for two things. Firſt, for imploying Women in the place and Office of Prieſts to offer a Cake (not in the nature of a gift or preſent,) but in the nature of a [a] Sacrifice, which was never lawful for any but [b] men, and thoſe [c] conſecrated.

[a] *Ut in nomen Virginis Collyridem quandam Sacrificarent.* Epiph. hær. 78. *Offerunt panem in nomen* Mariæ, *omnes autem pane participant* — [b] *Deo enim ab æterno nulla tenus mulier Sacrificavit.* Idem hæreſ. 79. [c] *Diaconiſſarum ordo eſt in Eccleſia, ſed non ad Sacrificandum, nam neque Diaconis concreditum eſt, ut aliquod myſterium perficiant.* Id. Ibid.

Secondly, for offering this [a] Sacrifice εἰς ὄνομα in the name of the Bleſſed Virgin, *i. e.* unto her, her ſelf directly and terminatively, as an act of [b] Divine Worſhip and ado-

[a] *vid. ſup. littera* (a)
[b] *Mortuis cultum divinum*

adoration, due unto her, as unto a Sovereign [c] Power and Deity.

præſtantes. Id. Ibid. *And again: Revera virgo erat honorata, ſed non ad adorationem nobis data ſed ipſa adorans Deum.* And again: *Non ut adoretur Virgo, nec ut Deum hanc efficeret,* &c. *Sit in honore* Maria; *Pater & Filius & Spiritus S. adoretur, Mariam nemo adoret. Deo debetur hoc myſterium* Id. Ibid.

[c] *Pro Deo hanc introducere ſtatuerant.* Id. Ibid. *Revera Sanctum erat* Mariæ *corpus non tamen Deus.* And again. *Mulierem eam appellavit* Joh. 2. *Velut prophetans: & ne aliqui nimium admirati Sanctum, in hanc hæreſin dilabantur.* And again. *Non tamen aliter genita eſt præter hominis naturam, ſed ſicut omnes ex ſemine viri & utero Mulieris.* Id. Ibid.

Reply. It ſeems then theſe Women might offer this Cake to the honour and name of the Virgin *Mary*, if they had done it as a *Gift* or *Preſent* and not as a *Sacrifice*. *Epiphanius* then ſurely was too haſty to condemn them, being informed of nothing, but that they offered a Cake unto her. Methinks before he had put them in his Catalogue, he ſhould have enquired whether they offered this Cake as a *Gift* only, or as a *Sacrifice*. Certainly had the practice of offering to Saints by way of gifts, been the practice of the Church in his time, he would not have been ſo uncharitable, as to condemn that action as impious and Heretical, which might have received ſo lawful and pious a conſtruction. But he, good man, it ſeems could not conceive a difference between a Sacrifice, and the offering a Creature by way of Conſumption to the Honour of that to which it is offered. The ſubtle Wits of our times I hope have found out another definition for it, and I ſhall underſtand by you what it is. But if you can find no other, then certainly, though ſetting up a Picture or hanging up a Leg or Eye or Ear in memory of ſome miraculous cure, obtained by a Saints interceſſion, would be a *Gift* or *Preſent* only; yet offering of Incenſe, or burning a Taper in the honour of a Saint, daub the matter how you will, will be without Queſtion a *Sacrifice*. If you ſay, that there may be ſuch an offering and yet no Sacrifice; I would know then, how you would prove that the *Collyridians* offering was indeed a Sacrifice? All that *Epiphanius* ſays of them is but this —— *Panem proponunt & in Mariæ nomen offerunt.* And though this

this offering of theirs was indeed a Sacrifice in the notion of the word which I have given it, yet doth he not any where ſay expreſly, *That they did Sacrifice, or offer it as a Sacrifice,* but only and barely that they did *offer it* : not uſing (as good fortune would have it) any word which doth of neceſſity and properly ſignifie *to Sacrifice* : and therefore you are fain to help the Dice, and alter every place for your advantage. *Epiphanius* ſays not, as you tranſlate him, *ut in nomen Virginis Collyridem quendam Sacrificent*; nor *Sacrificantes offerunt*, as *Petavius* : but ὡς ἐπιτελεῖν, which may as well ſignifie, to *conſecrate* or *offer*, as to *Sacrifice*; if there be any difference between them. So the next place, *offerunt panem in nomen Mariæ, omnes autem pane participant* ; proves not I hope offering by way of *Sacrifice*, unleſs the Conſumption of the oblation make it a *Sacrifice* ; which if it do, how your Tapers can be kept from being Sacrifices I cannot imagine; unleſs again perhaps Conſumption by way of *Eating* will make it a *Sacrifice*, and by *Burning* will not; which cannot be, becauſe the whole Burnt-offerings were Sacrifices as well as any other.

Your third place is, *Deo autem ab æterno nullatenus mulier Sacrificavit.* But ἱερατεύω ſignifies not *to Sacrifice*, but only to *perform the Office of a Prieſt*, and ſo *Petavius* tranſlates the place. *Nunquam ſacerdotio functa eſt mulier.* And though Sacrificing be *one* perhaps, yet will you not ſay it is the *only* Office of a Prieſt : as your next and laſt place would have declared, had you ſet it down faithfully; but in that alſo you juggle again, and force it to ſpeak to your purpoſe thus. *Diaconiſſarum ordo eſt in Eccleſia, ſed non ad Sacrificandum* : but *Petavius* hath tranſlated it truly thus : *Quanquam vero Diaconiſſarum in Eccleſia ordo ſit, non tamen ad ſacerdotii functionem, aut ullam adminiſtrationem inſtitutus eſt.* And now though by an uſual Synechdoche the name of the *Genus* be given to the *Species*, and therefore had a man fairly and candidly tranſlated ἱερατεύω by *Sacrifico*, I ſhould not have much condemned him, yet to do it when the Queſtion is, whether this their offering, confeſſed to be an offering, were in propriety of ſpeech a Sa-

a Sacrifice, to do it for Ends, to ſhift off a convincing argument, to palliate over a foul matter, by putting a verbal difference where there is none indeed, and all that you may, *Imperitos rerum in fraudem illicere*; that is —— But I forbear you.

But Secondly it is pretended, [*they offered this Sacrifice* εἰς ὄνομα *in the name of the Bleſſed Virgin*: i. e. *unto her, her ſelf, directly and terminately as an act of Divine Worſhip and adoration due unto her, as unto a Sovereign Power and Deity.*] And to colour and countenance this ſtrange gloſs, many places are quoted out of *Epiphanius*, which I will examine in order as they lie.

The firſt place is, *mortuis cultum Divinum præſtantes*, where your meaning is, I believe, that *Epiphanius* ſays the *Collyridians* did ſo: but the truth is he ſays only, *mortuos colentes*; as *Petavius* tranſlates it: and therefore here once again you help the Dice; yet if he had ſaid ſo, why ſhould you rather from *cultum divinum* collect that, that they thought her *God*, than from *mortuis*, that they thought her *Dead*, and therefore certainly not a God? Certainly this can be no warrant to you, that *Epiphanius* charges them with ſo thinking: For *Proteſtants* you know impute to *Papiſts* that they give to Saints *cultum divinum*, and yet they do not impute to them the Hereſie of thinking, that the Saints are Sovereign Powers and Deities: But as S. *Paul* accuſeth the Gentiles, for that knowing God to be God, *they did not worſhip him as God*, ſo on the other ſide, *Proteſtants* condemn *Papiſts*, and *Epiphanius* for ought we can ſee hitherto, might condemn the *Collyridians*, for that knowing the Bleſſed Virgin not to be God, they yet worſhip'd her as God. That is, gave her that worſhip which is Gods own peculiar, which yet they might do, not becauſe they thought her God, but becauſe this worſhip, which was indeed proper to God, they might think not proper, but communicable to ſuch Creatures as were high in his favour.

The next place is —— *Revera virgo erat honorata, ſed non ad adorationem nobis data, ſed ipſa adorans Deum*, &c.

I anſwer that the *&c.* perhaps conceals ſomething more pertinent to your purpoſe, but in the Words ſet down there appears to me juſt nothing; for I can frame out of them no other Syllogiſm but this.

Whatſoever *Epiphanius* in this place ſays is not to be adored, that the *Collyridians* thought to be God.

But *Epiphan.* here ſays the Virgin is not to be adored.

Ergo. The *Collyridians* thought her God.

Of this Syllogiſm I deny the Major propoſition, and I believe ſhall ſtay as long for a proof of it, as I have done for an anſwer to ſome other diſcourſes, which being written in a few days, have waited now with a longing expectation for a promiſed anſwer many months. If you ſay, you would conclude from theſe Words, that they did adore her and therefore thought her God, I have anſwered already, that they might do this, not becauſe they thought her God, but becauſe they thought Creatures high in Gods favour capable of adoration.

The next place —— *Non ut adoretur Virgo, nec ut deum hanc efficeret* — tells us that Chriſt took Fleſh of the Virgin, not that ſhe ſhould be adored, nor to make her God: And this you think imports, that they conceive her God. Yet if I ſhould, condemning your Practice of offering Tapers to her, uſe the ſame Words and ſay, — *Chriſt took Fleſh of the Virgin, not that ſhe ſhould be adored, or to make her God:* You would not yet conceive that I charged you with the Hereſie of believing her God, but only of the impiety of giving to her that worſhip which was peculiar to God: and why then might not *Epiphanius*, having like occaſion, uſe the ſame words to the *Collyridians* upon the ſame, and no other ground.

The next place —— *Mariam nemo adoret, Deo debetur hoc myſterium,* — is ſo far from proving your imagination, that it ſtrongly confirms my aſſertion, that *Epiphanius* did not impute to the *Collyridians* the opinion, *that the Virgin* Mary *was God.* If I ſhould ſay to a *Papiſt*, the Bleſſed Virgin is not to be worſhiped with the worſhip of *Hyperdaulia*, becauſe ſuch worſhip is due only to the Mother of God, would they not ſay I were mad and argued againſt my

my ſelf, for that they believed ſhe was the Mother of God. By like reaſon, if *Epiphanius* knew, that the *Collyridians* believed the Virgin *Mary* to be God, he reaſoned as wildly againſt himſelf in ſaying —— *Mariam nemo adoret, Deo debetur hoc myſterium* —— For it is very true (might they have ſaid) this ſervice is due to God alone, but you know our Belief and Profeſſion that ſhe is God, and therefore by your own rule capable of this worſhip.

The next place is — *Pro Deo hanc introducere ſtuduerunt.* And may not this be juſtly ſaid to any man, who to any thing beſides God, gives that worſhip which is proper and peculiar unto God? What if to man that ſhould teach — *The* Pope *had power to diſpenſe with men for the keeping of Gods Laws* — I ſhould ſay, *pro Deo Papam introducis.* Muſt I of neceſſity mean that that man did verily believe the *Pope* not a man but a Sovereign Power and Deity? S. *Paul* tells us that *Covetouſneſs is Idolatry*; he tells us of ſome, *whoſe God is their Belly*; is it therefore conſequent, that every covetous man doth indeed believe his *Gold*, and every Glutton his *Belly*, to be indeed a Sovereign Power and Deity? Away with ſuch fopperies. Whoſoever loves, or fears, or truſts in any thing more than God, may yet be juſtly ſaid to make that his God, and whoſoever ſhould worſhip any Creature with that external worſhip which God has appropriated to himſelf, might juſtly be ſaid to bring in that Creature for God. S. *Paul* tells us of ſome, who *in words profeſſed God*, yet *facti is negabant, in their deeds deny him*: ſo theſe on the contrary, may in their words deny this Creature to be God, and in their Hearts not think it ſo, yet ſeeing their actions to it are as if it were God, they may be juſtly charged, that with their deeds they make this Creature God.

Qui fingit Sacros ex auro & marmore vultus,
Non facit ille Deos, qui colit ille facit.

What if upon conſideration of the ſtrangely enormous worſhip which *Papiſts* give to the Virgin *Mary* (ſwearing by her name, making Vows unto her, offering Tapers to her Honour, attributing a kind of Communica-

ted omniſcience and almoſt omnipotence to her, as I can eaſily make good they do, partly out of the Offices of their Church, partly out of private mens Works, but ſet out with Licence and approbation) what I ſay, if upon this conſideration I ſhould affirm, *pro Deo ipſam introducere conantur.* Would it therefore be conſequent, that I muſt impute this Blaſphemy to them, that they believed and taught her to be a Sovereign Power and Deity? I trow not. And therefore *Epiphanius* might ſay the ſame of the *Collyridians* conſidering their *Action*, without any intent of imputing to them any ſuch *opinion.* This *Petavius* ſure ſaw well enough, and therefore (as I ſhall hereafter demonſtrate to the Eye) to countenance his Marginal Annotation, *Quidam Mariam Deum eſſe crediderunt*, he cunningly abuſes and perverts *Epiphanius* his Text with falſe Tranſlation. —— *Sic pugnat, Sic eſt metuendus Ulyſſes.* —— The next place is, *revera ſanctum erat* Mariæ *corpus non tamen Deus.* (*The Body of* Mary *was truly holy, but not a God.*) As much to the purpoſe as —*Tityre tu patulæ* —— for what if *Epiphanius* ſay, ſhe is not God, and therefore not to be adored, does it therefore follow that the *Collyridians* believed ſhe was a God? He that knows Logick or ſenſe, cannot but know, that he that will confute an Adverſaries concluſion, muſt chooſe ſuch principles to do it, to which his Adverſary conſents, and out of that which he grants prove that which he denies; or if his firſt propoſitions be not agreed to by his Adverſary, he muſt prove them in the end by ſuch as are agreed to; or elſe he does nothing. And therefore ſeeing *Epiphanius* thinks it ſufficient for the convincing of the *Collyridians*, of the unlawfulneſs of the practice, to ſay, ſhe was not God: it is evident, that ſo far was he from imputing to them the belief that ſhe was God, that he ſeems rather to take the contrary for a principle agreed upon between them, which it was ſufficient to ſay and ſuperfluous to prove. This anſwer I thought good to make, while I conceived that here *Epiphanius* had denied the Perſon of the Virgin *Mary* to be God; but after upon better conſideration I found that *Petavius* had abuſed me with adding to *Epi-*

phanius

phanius of his own —— *Illa fuit* —— and that *Epiphanius* ſays not here, *non tamen Deus* (*ſhe was not God*) of her *Perſon*, but of her *Body*; and as yet I do not underſtand that you impute to the *Collyridians* the belief, that her Body was God.

The next place —— *Mulierem eam appellavit*, &c. —— ſays no more but this; that our Saviour calls the Bleſſed Virgin *Woman*, that no man might think her any thing more than a Woman, as it were prophetically refuting the Schiſms and Hereſies which would be in the World: leſt ſome out of exceſs of admiration of her, might fall into the Dotage of this Hereſie. Thus far *Epiphanius*: but then the Queſtion will be, what was this Hereſie. You ſay the belief that ſhe was God. I ſay, not that ſhe was God, but that they might lawfully offer to her. And as I deny not but it follows, *ſhe is a Woman, therefore not a God*; ſo I think you will grant it follows as juſtly, *ſhe is a Woman, therefore not to be adored with offerings.* And therefore ſeeing the words lie indifferently between us, and are not expreſly and eſpecially here applied, for the refutation of that Hereſie which you pretend they were guilty of, I ſee no reaſon why *Epiphanius* might not as well intend them for that purpoſe which I conceive, as for that which you conceive.

The laſt place alledged tells us, *that ſhe was begotten and Born as other Men and Women are.* Which if the *Collyridians* had thought her God, Eternal and abſolutely without beginning, ſhould not have been barely ſaid but proved, as being in effect the very point in queſtion; and therefore ſeeing *Epiphanius* contents himſelf with ſaying ſo without proof, it is evident he never thought they would make difficulty to grant it, and conſequently that they did not believe her to be God Eternal.

But then again, if the Rule be good which part of your proofs depend upon, That whatever *Epiphanius* denies in this diſcourſe, that the *Collyridians* held (for upon that ground from —— *Non & Deum hanc efficeret: & non tamen Deus*, you conclude they believed her God) If I ſay this Rule be good, then you ſhould be conſtant to it, and

and now that he ſays, —— *Non tamen aliter genita eſt præter hominum naturam, (ſhe was not begotten in a different way from other men)* you ſhould infer, that they believed not that ſhe was God, but that ſhe was otherwiſe Born and Begotten than the ordinary ſort of Men. And ſo whereas he ſays before —— *Non tamen corpus de cælo tulit* - —— *(her Body was not from Heaven)* you ſhould infer, that they believed her Body came from Heaven. And again from thoſe —— *Sanctum erat Mariæ corpus non tamen Deus* —— you ſhould collect that they thought not only her perſon, but her Body to be God: or if theſe be wild and weak deductions, then you muſt acknowledge that I have done yours ſome favour in vouchſafing them a particular anſwer.

5. *Demand.* Whether in the Church of *Roman*, it be not an approved and perpetually practiſed worſhip of the Bleſſed Virgin, that Incenſe (which was never anciently offered unto any, either by *Jews* or *Gentiles*, but to the true, or to a ſuppoſed true God) and Tapers and divers other oblations, ſhould be offered to her honour?

Anſw. A practice of the Church of *Rome*, and approved too by thoſe that practiſe it, belongs not to her, except it be a practice of the Church and approved by her. What her practice is abroad I know not; here at home I ſee no ſuch practice; nor do I know any approbation of it, in any of her publick declarations: But this I know, that there is nothing in it unlawful or favouring of the *Collyridian Superſtition*, to offer Wax, Tapers or any other thing at the Memories of the Bleſſed Virgin or any other Canonized Saint, either as means to procure their interceſſion, by theſe outward Signs of the Honour and Devotion which they bear to them (as of Old we find by S. *Auſtin* [a] they did uſe to adorn their Tombs with Flowers) or as monuments of their thankfulneſs for ſome benefits received by their Interceſſion, as *Theodoret* [b] tells

[a] Ad *aquas Tibilotanas, Epiſcopo offerente Projecto, reliquias martyris glorioſiſſimi* Stephani, *ad ejus memoriam veniebat magnæ multitudinis concurſus & occurſus. Ibi cæca mulier, ut ad epiſcopum portantem pignora Sacra duceretur, oravit: Flores quos ferebat dedit; recepit, oculis admovit, protenus vidit.* Auguſt. de Civit. Dei. l. 22. c. 8. *abſcedens aliquid de Altari* (S. Stephani) *florum quod occurrit, tulit.* Idem. Ibid. &c. [b] *Theodoretus de curandis affec:* Græc. l. 8.

us

us of Eyes and Ears and Hands, ſome of Gold and ſome of Silver (hung up in the Chappels of the Saints) that had been preſented as oblations by thoſe that had recovered health in thoſe Members, according to their Vows made to that purpoſe in time of Sickneſs.

Reply. I do not deny, but a practice may be *tolerated* in a Church, and not *approved.* As the *Publick Stews* are in *Italy*, and *Uſury* in *England*: But it is one thing to Tolerate with condemnation, another to Tolerate without condemnation, nay with condemnation of thoſe that ſhould oppoſe or condemn it. And ſuch I doubt not upon examination, you may find is this practice, general in the Church of *Rome*, offering Tapers to the Saints and for their honour. I ſay, not only to God, at the Memories of the Saints, as you would mince the matter, which yet were a groundleſs ſuperſtition, (God having appointed no ſuch Sacrifice to be offered to him under the Goſpel) but to the Saints themſelves and to their honour, prove this lawful for either of thoſe purpoſes you mention, either to procure their interceſſion or as Monuments of thankfulneſs for benefits obtained by it, and then you ſhall do ſomething. Otherwiſe you will but trifle as now you have done: For inſtead of telling us what may be done *de jure*, you tell us what of Old has been done *de facto.* As if *ab antiquo*, and a *principio* were all one; or as if the Church (as we pretend) being ſubject to corruption, part of this corruption might not poſſibly have come in S. *Auſtins* or *Theodorets* time; yet this I ſay not, as if I would decline the Tryal of this cauſe by S. *Auſtin* or *Theodoret*; but becauſe I am ſure you will not be Tryed by the Fathers, no not the conſent of Fathers in all things: and therefore there is no reaſon nor equity in the World, that you ſhould ſerve your ſelves with their Authority in any thing.

But now what is it, which was done in S. *Auſtins* time, that may juſtifie the Practice of the *Roman* Church? was there then any approved offering of Wax, Tapers and Incenſe, to the Queen of Heaven or any other Saint? *nil horum*: you neither do nor can produce any thing out of S. *Auſtin* to this purpoſe. But what then is it? Why forſooth,

forſooth, they were uſed to adorn their Tombs: *Egregiam verò laudem & ſpolia ampla*; of Old in S. *Auſtins* time they were uſed to adorn their Tombs with Flowers, therefore we may offer Tapers to them. Truly an excellent *Enthymeme*, but I fear the concealed propoſition which ſhould make it a *Syllogiſm*, hides its head for ſhame and dares not appear: yet we will for once make bold to draw it forth into light, that you may look upon it and tell us how you like it. This therefore it is.

Whoſe ſoever Tombs we adorn, to them and to their honour we may offer Wax Tapers.

Conſider it I pray you, and if you approve it, then approve alſo of offering Tapers not only to Canonize Saints, but to all Chriſtians that may have Monuments in Churches. For all their Tombs may be adorned, with more pretious and laſting Ornaments than Flowers; yet if you had proved but this only, that in S. *Auſtins* time, they adorned the Saints Tombs with Flowers by theſe outward ſigns to procure their Interceſſion; this, though not much to the purpoſe, had been not abſolutely to delude us. But your quoted places prove not ſo much as this; and yet I believe you quoted the beſt you could find. Nay they prove not they did adorn their Tombs with Flowers at all, much leſs that they did it for your pretended purpoſe; ſuch fools you think to deal with, that will take any thing for any thing. Your firſt place, I ſay, proves it not, unleſs out of meer courteſie we underſtand by *ferebat*, *ſhe brought to adorn S.* Stephens *Tomb.*

The Second proves it not, unleſs we give you leave after *Altari* (without warrant from S. *Auſtin*) to put in, S. *Stephani*, whereas I am yet to ſeek for any place in S. *Auſtin*, where he calls any Altar, the Altar of ſuch or ſuch a Saint, which yet I think they forbore not for the unlawfulneſs, but for fear of miſconſtruction.

Then for *Theodoret*, he tells us indeed of Vows made, of monuments of thankfulneſs dedicated, for benefits obtained by the interceſſion of the Martyrs. But here alſo I fear your Conſcience tells you, that you abuſe us and hide your ſelf in ambiguities. For to whom does *Theodoret* ſay

ſay theſe Vows were made? to whom were theſe monuments of thankfulneſs dedicated? What, to the Author? or Procures of the received favours? To God, or to the Martyrs? If to the Martyrs, that had been ſomething towards, though not home to your purpoſe: For there is a a wide difference between offering of a Creature by way of Conſumption (as was never lawfully done but to God alone, as a profeſſion that he is the Lord of the Creature) and erecting a permanent Monument to a Saints honour; which I doubt not but it may lawfully be done to a living Saint, much more to the memory of a Martyr. But *Theodoret* in the place, hath not ſo much as this: Nay it is evident that theſe gifts he ſpeaks of, were both Vowed and payed to God himſelf. His words are —— *Piè precatos ea conſequi*, &c. —— that they which pray piouſly, obtain the things which they deſire, they paying of their Vowed preſents in the ſign of their recovered health, doth abundantly teſtifie. For their Lord accepts moſt gratiouſly theſe preſents how mean ſo ever.

6. *Demand.* Whether according to the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, this may not be done lawfully by Women and Children, and men that are not Prieſts?

Anſw. They may offer any thing by way of *gifts* and *preſents*, by the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church; But it is contrary to the *Roman* Doctrine, for any other than Prieſts, to offer any thing by way of *Sacrifice*, as the *Collyridians* did.

Reply. Ariſtotle ſays moſt truly, that true Definitions (he means I think of the terms of the concluſion to be demonſtrated) are the beſt principles of Science: and therefore want of them, muſt needs be a cauſe of Error and confuſion in any diſcourſe. Let me therefore here requeſt you to ſet down what is a *Sacrifice*, and how diſtinguiſhed from an oblation by way of *gift* or *preſent*, and you will quickly ſee, that if the *Collyridians* offering a Cake to the Bleſſed Virgin were indeed a *Sacrifice*, your offering a Taper to her, muſt likewiſe be ſo. For a *Sacrifice* is nothing elſe (for ought I know) but the oblation of any Creature by way of *Conſumption*, to the honour

of that, whatſoever it is, to which it is offered. For if you include in the definition, that this offering muſt be intended to the higheſt Lord of all: So is, as you pretend, your offering of Tapers to the Bleſſed Virgin, intended to God finally, though not immediately. If you ſay it muſt be directed immediatly to him; and is, not only *no lawful Sacrifice*, but ſimply *no Sacrifice* unleſs it be ſo: I ſay you may as well require to the eſſence of a Sacrifice, that it be offered by a Prieſt, and from thence conclude, becauſe the *Collyridians* were, you ſay, no Prieſts, their offering was no Sacrifice. For the object of the Action is as extrinſecal to the eſſence of it, as the efficient; And therefore if the defect of a due and legitimate Offerer, cannot hinder but that an offering may be a true Sacrifice, neither will the want of a due and lawful object be any hindrance but ſtill it may be ſo. Secondly, I ſay, this is to confound the eſſence of things with the lawful uſe of them; in effect as if you ſhould ſay, that a Knife, if miſimployed, were a Knife no longer. Thirdly, it is to make it not unlawful, to offer Incenſe (which yet you ſeem ſomewhat ſcrupulous of) or Burnt-offerings to the Virgin *Mary*, or the Saints, or even to living Men, provided you know and believe and profeſs them to be Men and not Gods. For this once ſuppoſed, theſe offerings will be no longer Sacrifices, and to offer to Creatures offerings that are not Sacrifices, you ſay, by the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church is lawful: It is laſtly, to deny (which is moſt ridiculous) that the *Pagans* did indeed Sacrifice to any of their inferiour Gods.

7. *Demand.* If it be ſaid, that this worſhip which they give to the Bleſſed Virgin is not that of *Latria*, but that of *Dulia* or *Hyperdulia*, for that they do not eſteem her God: or if it be ſaid, that their worſhip to her is not finally terminated neither, but given her for her relation to Chriſt. I demand, whether as it is, in S. *Pauls* judgment, a great crime for him that knows God, not to worſhip him as God, ſo it be not as great a crime, for him that knows her not to be God, yet to worſhip her (as if ſhe were God) with the worſhip which is proper and

and hath been alwaies appropriated to God alone, ſuch is the *worſhip of oblations*?

Anſw. The *worſhip of oblations*, as *worſhip* is taken largly for *honour*, and *oblations* for a *gift* or *preſent*, was never appropriate to God alone; take *worſhip* and *oblations* in any higher ſenſe, and ſo it is not allowed in the Church of *Rome*.

Reply. The *oblation* of things by way of *Conſumption*, is the worſhip I ſpoke of; this is a higher matter, than that of *gifts* and *preſents*, and this is allowed in the Church of *Rome*, to be imployed on, and directed into, (though not terminated in) the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints.

8. *Demand.* Whether any thing can be ſaid for the juſtifying the Doctrine and practice of the *Roman* Church in this matter, which might not alſo have been as juſtly pretended, for the juſtification of the *Collyridians* in their opinion and practice; ſeeing it was never imputed to them, that they accounted the Bleſſed Virgin God, or that they believed in more Gods than one. And ſeeing their chooſing her out, rather than any other Woman or any other Creature for the object of their Devotion, ſhews plainly, that they gave it her for her Relation to Chriſt?

Anſw. The *Collyridians* could not ſay this, as appears by what has been ſaid before: As it is a moſt ſhameleſs ſlander upon Gods Church, and ſuch as (without repentance) will lie heavy upon his Soul that uttered it, that the *Collyridians* might as juſtly and truly have ſaid all this for themſelves as *Papiſts* for themſelves.

Reply. To this I reply four things. 1. That to my laſt and moſt convincing reaſon, you have anſwered (as much as you could I believe, but yet you have anſwered) nothing; and I am well content you ſhould do ſo; for where nothing is to be had, the King himſelf muſt loſe his right. 2. That if I had thought or ſpoke better of the *Collyridians* than they deſerved, yet I cannot ſee how this had been to ſlander the Church of *Rome*. 3. That I did not poſitively affirm, that the *Collyridians* might do ſo, but deſired only it might be inquired into and examined,

whether for the reaſons alledged they might not do ſo. 4. And laſtly, upon a thorow examination of the matter, I do now affirm, what before I did not, that the *Collyridians* for ought appears to the contrary, might juſtly and truly have ſaid for the juſtification of their practice, as much, nay the very ſame things that the *Papiſts* do for theirs. For they might have ſaid, we are Chriſtians and believe the Scripture, and believe there is but one God. We offer not to the Bleſſed Virgin, as believing ſhe is God, but the Mother of God: our worſhip of her is not abſolute but relative, not terminated in her, but given to her for her Sons ſake: And if our practice may be allowed, we are content to call our Oblation, not a Sacrifice, but a preſent: neither is there any reaſon, why it ſhould be called a Sacrifice, more than the Offering and Burning a Taper to the honour of the ſame Virgin. All this the *Collyridians* might have ſaid for themſelves: and therefore I believe, you will have more cauſe to repent you for daubing over impiety with untempered Morter, than I ſhall have for ſlandering the *Roman* Church with a matter of truth.

9. *Demand.* Whether therefore, one of the two muſt not of neceſſity follow: that either the Ancient Church Erred in condemning the Opinion and Practice of the *Collyridians* as Heretical, or elſe that the Church of *Rome* Errs, in approving the ſame opinion, and the ſame practice in effect, which in them was condemned. That is, whether the Church of *Rome* muſt not be Heretical with the *Collyridians*, or elſe the *Collyridians* Catholicks with the Church of *Rome*?

Anſw. It appears by the former anſwers, that neither did the Ancient Church Err, in condemning the opinion and practice of the *Collyridians*, as Heretical, nor doth the Church of *Rome* approve the ſame opinion or the ſame practice.

Reply. The Subſtance of the former anſwers is but this. That the *Papiſts* offer to the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints Wax Tapers by way of *gift* or *preſent*, not of Sacrifice; and to her not as to a God, but as the Mother of God:

God: but that the *Collyridians* offered to her by way of Sacrifice, as to a Sovereign Power and Deity. To this I have replied and proved, that it no way appears, that the *Collyridians* did believe the Bleſſed Virgin to be a Sovereign Power and Deity, or that ſhe was not ſubordinate to God. Then that their offering might be called a *gift*, as well as the *Papiſts*, and the *Papiſts* a *Sacrifice* as well as theirs; both of them being a *Conſumption* of a Creature in honour of the Bleſſed Virgin, and neither of them more than ſo: and therefore either the *Collyridians* muſt ſtand with the Church of *Rome*, or the Church of *Rome* fall with the *Collyridians*. It had been perhaps ſufficient for me, thus to have vindicated my Aſſertion from contrary objections, without taking on my ſelf the burden of proving a Negative: yet to free from all doubt the conformity of the *Roman* Church with the *Collyridians*, in this point, I think it will be neceſſary to ſhew, and that by many very probable Arguments, that *Epiphanius* did not impute to them the pretended Hereſie of *believing* the Virgin *Mary God:* for then that other Evaſion, that their oblation is a Sacrifice and the *Papiſts* is not, together with this pretence will of it ſelf fall to the ground.

Now an opinion may be imputed to a man two ways: either becauſe he holds and maintains it expreſly and formally and in terms: or becauſe it may by a rational deduction be collected from ſome other opinion which he does hold: In this latter ſenſe I deny not but *Epiphanius* might impute this opinion we ſpeak of to the *Collyridians*, as a conſequence upon their practice, which practice they eſteemed lawful. But that they held it and owned it formally and in terms, this I ſay *Epiphanius* does not impute to them, which I think for theſe ſeven reaſons.

My firſt Reaſon is, becauſe he could not juſtly do ſo, and therefore without evident proof we may not ſay he did ſo: for this were to be uncharitable to him, in making him uncharitable to others. Now I ſay he could not juſtly charge them with this opinion, becauſe he was not informed of any ſuch opinion that they held, but only of their

their practice, and this practice was no ſufficient proof that they held this opinion. That his information reached no further than their Practice, appears out of his own Words. *I have heard* (ſaith he. Hæreſ. 78.) *another thing with great aſtoniſhment: that ſome being madly affected to the Bleſſed Virgin, endeavour to bring her in in Gods place, being mad and beſides themſelves: For they report that certain Women in* Arabia *have deviſed this Vanity, to have meetings, and offer a Cake to the Bleſſed Virgin:* The ſame practice he ſets down *Hæreſ.* 79. But that he was informed of any ſuch opinion that they held, he has not a Word or Syllable to any ſuch purpoſe; and yet if he had been informed of any, here had been the place to ſet it down: which certainly writing his Book rather of Heretical opinions than practices, he would not have omitted to do; if there had been occaſion: his ſilence therefore is a ſufficient Argument, that he was not informed of any ſuch opinion that they held.

Now that their practice was no aſſurance that they held this opinion, it is manifeſt; becauſe they might ground it not upon this opinion *that ſhe was God*, but upon another as falſe, though not altogether ſo impious, *That the Worſhip of Oblations was not proper to God alone.* And therefore, though *Epiphanius* might think or fear that poſſibly they might ground their practice upon that other impious opinion, and therefore out of abundant caution confute that alſo, as he doth obliquely and in a word, and once only in all his long diſcourſe, by telling them that our Saviour called her *Woman*; yet he had no ground from their practice to aſſure himſelf, that certainly they did hold ſo. Nay Juſtice and Reaſon and Charity would, that he ſhould incline himſelf to believe, that they grounded their practice upon that other opinion, which had leſs impiety in it, that is, that this worſhip of Oblations, was not proper to God, but communicable to Creatures high in his favour.

My ſecond is, Becauſe if *Epiphanius* had known, that theſe *Collyridians* held the Bleſſed Virgin to be a Supream Power and Deity; this being a far greater matter than offering

offering a Cake to her, ſhould in all probability rather have given them their denomination: at leaſt when he ſets down what their Hereſie was, he would have made this part of it, that they did believe ſo: But to the contrary, in his *Anacæphaleoſis*, p. 130. he thus deſcribes them. *They that offer to the name of the Bleſſed Virgin Cakes, who are called* Collyridians. And again, p. 150. *They that offer to the Bleſſed Virgin Cakes who are called* Collyridians: So to the 79th. Hereſie he gives this Title, *Againſt the* Collyridians *who offer to* Mary: So *Hæreſ.* 78, and 79. He ſets down what he heard of them; but no where that they held this opinion of her: I conclude therefore, that he never conceived this opinion to be a part of their Hereſie, and they were no further chargeable with it, than as a probable conſequent upon their practice.

My third is, Becauſe had the *Collyridians* held her God, they would have worſhiped her all the year long, and not only once a year at a Solemn time, as *Epiphanius* ſays they did.

My fourth is, Becauſe if *Epiphanius* had known that they held her God, he would queſtionleſs have urged them with thoſe Attributes that are given to God in Scripture, as Eternity, Immortallity, Impoſſibility, Omnipotence, *&c.* And ſhewed them, that if they believed the Scripture, they could not think of her any of thoſe things; if they did not, they had no reaſon to think of her any thing more than of an ordinary Woman.

My fifth is, becauſe had their opinion been, that the Bleſſed Virgin was God; a great part of *Epiphanius*'s diſcourſe were plainly ridiculous; both where he ſays only without proof, ſhe was not a God but a Mortal Creature, which to them that held the contrary ſhould not have been ſaid, but proved: But eſpecially where he ſpeaks to this purpoſe (as he does very frequently) that the honour of Oblations was not to be given to Angels or Men, much leſs to Women, but only to God: for what had that been to the *Collyridians*, if they thought her (as is pretended) a Sovereign Power and Deity? to what purpoſe was it for *Epiphanius* to ask, *Quis prophetam*; *What*

prophet

prophet ever permitted, that a Man, much leſs a Woman ſhould be adored, though he be yet alive. Nor John *nor* Tecla, *nor any other Saint. For neither ſhall the Old Superſtition have dominion over us, that leaving the Living God, we ſhould Adore his Creatures.* To what end I ſay was all this, if they thought her not a Saint nor Creature, but God himſelf and the Lord of all? How did this Argument touch them? *Ne Angelos quidem* —— *He ſuffers not the very Angels to be adored, how much leſs the Daughter of* Anna? if they thought her not the Daughter of *Anna*, but God Eternal; In vain had it been to ſay to them — *Not to a Woman, no nor to a Man, but to God alone, is this miſtery (*of Oblation) *due.* So that the Angels themſelves are not fit Subjects for ſuch an honour. Or again, *Let the Creature be turned to the Creator: Let ſhame at length compel you to worſhip God alone:* Or laſtly, that ſo often repeated —— *Let* Mary *be honoured, but the Lord only adored.* For they might have anſwered all this in a word, ſaying, All this diſcourſe ſits beſides the Cuſhion, and concerns us and our offering nothing at all. For we believe the Bleſſed Virgin to whom we offer neither Man nor Woman, nor Angel, nor Creature, but a Deity.

A Sixth Reaſon let it be this, If *Epiphanius* did indeed ſay of the *Collyridians* as is pretended, That they held the Virgin *Mary* God, and ſo difference their practice from the *Papiſts*: Then the Author of this Anſwer and *Petavius* in his Tranſlation, needed not to have dictated to him what he ſhould ſay, nor make him ſay ſo whether he will or no: But it is evident they do ſo, as of the Author of this Anſwer I have already ſhewn: and for *Petavius* his part, I will ſo preſent it to your view, that if you will not ſhut your Eyes, you ſhall not chooſe but ſee it.

Firſt then, *Hæreſ.* 78. *propè fin.* he *(Petavius)* ſets in his Margent, *quidam Deum Mariam eſſe, crediderunt*; and to countenance this with a *loquuntur* of his own putting in, makes them *ſpeak* of her like mad Men, *i. e.* they ſaid ſhe was God: whereas in *Epiphanius*'s Greek they ſay juſt nothing.

Secondly,

Secondly, To faſten the pretended Opinion on them, he tranſlates καινοφώνημα *Novum dogma:* preſuming it ſeems καινοφόνημα would eaſily be miſtaken for καινοφάνημα, and therefore meanes nothing by it, but a vanity or folly.

Thirdly, He tranſlates τῦτο, *Illud*; and ſo makes it look backward to that pretended *Novum dogma* of the *Collyridians*; whereas it ſignifies there [And] and looks forward to their practice.

Fourthly, With the help of a *Colon*, he ſtops the ſenſe at *Commentas fuiſſe*, whereas in *Epiphanius* there is but a *Comma*, and the ſenſe goes on without ſuſpenſion.

Fifthly, With an *adeo ut*, he brings in their action, as an effect of their former opinion; whereas *Epiphanius* lays nothing to their charge but their Action only: So that whereas *Epiphanius* his words truly tranſlated run thus: *Another thing I have received with great aſtoniſhment, that others being mad concerning the Bleſſed Virgin, have and do go about to bring her in, in the place of God, being mad, I ſay, and beſides themſelves: For they report that certain Women in* Arabia *have brought this vanity of offering a Cake to her name.* Petavius makes them thus —— *Not without admiration we have heard another thing, that ſome in theſe things that concern the moſt holy Virgin have proceeded to that degree of madneſs, that they would obtrude her upon us for a God, and ſpeak of her as madmen: For they report that certain Women in* Arabia, *have invented that new Opinion: ſo that to the Virgins name and honour, they offer by way of ſacrifice a Cake or wreath of Bread.*

Again in the ſame *Hæreſ.* ἱερεύειν διὰ γυναικῶν, he tranſlates advantageouſly——*per mulieres ſacrificia facere.* Whereas ἱερεύειν is more general than *ſacrificia facere*, and ſignifies *ſacris operari*, or *ſacros ritus peragere.*

Again, in the ſame place, whereas *Epiphanius* ſays ſimply and abſolutely——*Let no man offer to her name*, he makes it, *Let no man offer ſacrifice to her name*; as if you might lawfully offer any thing provided you do not call it a ſacrifice.

So again *Hæreſ.*79. beſides his putting cunningly——*ipſa fuit*——which before we took notice of; he makes no ſcruple to put in *Dogma* and *Sacrificium*, whereſoever it may be for his purpoſe. *Epiphanius* his title to this Hereſie is, *Againſt the* Collyridians *who offer to* Mary——*Petavius* puts in——*Sacrifice.*

Again in the ſame page, before *D.* he puts in his own *illo dogmate*, and whereas *Epiphanius* ſays–*in all this*, he makes it, *in all this Opinion.*

Pag. 1061. τὸ γυναικῶδες ὑπόγειον, he tranſlates, *this womaniſh Opinion*, whereas ὑπόγεια though perhaps it may ſignifie a *thought*, or act of thinking, yet I believe it never ſignifies an *Opinion* which we hold.

Ibid. at *B.* τοῦτο——this——he renders *this Opinion.*

Pag. 1064. at *C. Nor that we ſhould offer to her name*, ſimply and abſolutely: he makes it,——*Nor that we ſhould offer ſacrifice to her name.* So many times is he fain to corrupt, and tranſlate him partially, leſt in condemning the *Collyridians*, he might ſeem to have involved the practice of the *Roman Church* in the ſame Condemnation.

My Seventh and laſt Reaſon is this. Had *Epiphanius* known that the *Collyridians* held the *Virgin Mary* to be a Sovereign power and Deity, then he could not have doubted, whether this their offering was to her or to God for her: whereof yet he ſeems doubtful and not fully reſolved, as his own words intimate, *Hæreſ.*79. *ad fin. Quam multa* &c. *How many things may be objected againſt this Hereſie? for idle Women either worſhipping the Bleſſed Virgin, offer unto her a Cake, or elſe they take upon them to offer for her this foreſaid ridiculous oblation. Now both are fooliſh and from the Devil.*

Theſe Arguments I ſuppoſe do abundantly demonſtrate to any man not viel'd with prejudice, that *Epiphanius* imputed not to the *Collyridians* the Hereſie of believing the Virgin *Mary* God: and if they did not think her God, there is then no reaſon imaginable why their oblation of a *Cake*, ſhould not be thought a *Preſent*, as well as the Papiſts

Papiſts offering a *Taper*, or that the Papiſts offering a *Taper*, ſhould not be thought a *Sacrifice*, as well as their offering a *Cake*; and ſeeing this was the difference pretended between them, this being vaniſhed there remains none at all; So that my firſt Concluſion ſtands yet firm; that either the Ancient Church erred in condemning the *Collyridians*, or the preſent errs in approving and practiſing the ſame worſhip.

An Advertisement.

The Reader when he meets with the Phraſe *Catholick Doctrin*, in the two following Diſcourſes, muſt remember, that it does not ſignifie *Articles of Faith* determined in any General Councils, which might be looked upon as the Faith of the whole Church; but the *Current* and *Common Opinion* of the Age, which obtained in it without any known oppoſition and contradiction. Neither need this be wondred at, ſince they are about matters far removed from the Common Faith of Chriſtians, and having no neceſſary influence upon good life and manners, whatſoever neceſſity, by miſtake of ſome Scriptures, might be put upon them.

IV. *An Argument drawn from the admitting Infants to the Euchariſt, as without which they could not be ſaved, againſt the Churches Infallibility.*

THE Condition without the performance whereof no man can be admitted to the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, is this; that he believe firmly and without doubting, whatſoever the Church requires him to believe: More diſtinctly and particularly thus:

He muſt believe all that to be divine Revelation which that Church teaches to be ſuch; as the Doctrin of the Trinity, the Hypoſtatical union of two natures in the perſon of Chriſt. The proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son: the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, and ſuch like.

Whatſoever that Church teaches to be neceſſary, he muſt believe to be neceſſary. As Baptiſm for Infants; Faith in Chriſt, for thoſe that are Capable of Faith; Penance for thoſe that have committed mortal ſin after Baptiſm, &c.

Whatſoever that Church declares expedient and profitable, he muſt believe to be expedient and profitable: as Monaſtical Life: Prayer to Saints: Prayer for the Dead: going on Pilgrimages: The uſe of Pardons: Veneration of holy Images and Reliques: Latin Service where the people underſtand it not: Communicating the Laity in one kind and ſuch like.

Whatſoever that Church holdeth lawful, he muſt believe lawful: As to Marry: to make diſtinction of Meats, as if ſome were clean and others unclean: to flie in time of Perſecution: for them that ſerve at the Altar, to live by the Altar: to teſtifie a truth by Oath, when a lawful Magiſtrate ſhall require it: to poſſeſs Riches, &c.

Now is it impoſſible that any man ſhould certainly believe any thing; unleſs either it be evident of it ſelf, or he have ſome certain reaſon (at leaſt ſome ſuppoſed certain reaſon) and infallible ground for his belief. Now the Doctrins

Doctrins which the Church of *Rome* teacheth, it is evident and undeniable that they are not evident of themſelves, neither evidently true nor evidently credible. He therefore that will believe them, muſt of neceſſity have ſome certain and infallible ground whereon to build his belief of them.

There is no other ground for a Mans belief of them, eſpecially in many points, but only an aſſurance of the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome.* No man can be aſſured that that Church is infallible and cannot err, whereof he may be aſſured that ſhe hath erred, unleſs ſhe had ſome new promiſe of divine aſſiſtance, which might for the future ſecure her from danger of erring; but the Church of *Rome* pretends to none ſuch.

Nothing is more certain, than that that Church hath erred, which hath believed and taught irreconcileable Contradictions, one whereof muſt of neceſſity be an Error.

That the Receiving the Sacrament of the Euchariſt is neceſſary for Infants, and that the receiving thereof is not neceſſary for them: That it is the will of God, that the Church ſhould adminiſter the Sacrament to them; and that it is not the will of God that the Church ſhould do ſo; are manifeſt and irreconcileable Contradictions: Suppoſing only, (that which is moſt evident) that the Euchariſt is the ſame thing, of the ſame vertue and efficacy now, as it was in the primitive Church: That Infants are the ſame things they were, have as much need, are capable of as much benefit by the Euchariſt, now as then: As ſubject to irreverent carriages, then as now. And laſtly, that the preſent Church is as much bound to provide for the ſpiritual good of Infants, as the Ancient Church was: I ſay theſe things ſuppoſed, the propoſitions before ſet down are plain and irreconcileable Contradictions: whereof the preſent *Roman* Church doth hold the Negative, and the Ancient Church of *Rome* did hold the Affirmative; and therefore it is evident, that either the preſent Church doth err, in holding ſomething not neceſſary, which is ſo; or that the Ancient Church did err, in holding ſomething neceſſary, which was not ſo.

For

For the Negative Propoſition, *viz. That the Euchariſt is not neceſſary for Infants*; that it is the Doctrin of the preſent Church of *Rome* it is moſt manifeſt. 1. From the diſuſe and abolition and prohibition of the contrary Ancient practice. For if the Church did conceive it neceſſary for them, either ſimply for their ſalvation, or elſe for their increaſe or confirmation in grace, and advancement to a higher degree of glory (unleſs ſhe could ſupply ſome other way their damage in this thing, which evidently ſhe cannot) what an uncharitable ſacriledge is it, to debar and defraud them of the neceſſary means of their ſo great ſpiritual benefit? eſpecially ſeeing the adminiſtration of it might be ſo ordered, that irreverent caſualties might eaſily be prevented: which yet ſhould they fall out againſt the Churches and Paſtors intention, certainly could not offend God, and in reaſon ſhould not offend man. Or if the Church do believe, that upon ſuch a vain fear of irreverence (which we ſee moved not the Ancient Church at all) ſhe may lawfully forbid ſuch a general, perpetual and neceſſary charity, certainly herein ſhe commits a far greater error than the former. Secondly, from the Council of *Trents* Anathema, denounced on all that hold the contrary, in theſe words. *If any man ſay that the receiving of the Euchariſt, is neceſſary for little children, before they come to years of diſcretion, let him be Anathema.* Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 21. *de communione parvulorum*, Can. 4.

Now for the Affirmative part of the Contradiction, to make it evident that that was the Doctrin of the Ancient Church; I will prove it, Firſt, from the general practice of the Ancient Church for ſeveral Ages. Secondly, by the direct and formal Teſtimonies of the Fathers of thoſe times. Thirdly, by the confeſſion of the moſt learned Antiquaries of the *Roman* Church. My Firſt Argument I form thus. If to communicate Infants was the general practice of the Ancient Church for many Ages; then certainly the Church then believed, that the Euchariſt was neceſſary for them, and very available for their Spiritual benefit: But it is certain, that the Communicating of Infants was the general practice of the Church for many

Ages

Ages: Therefore the Church of thoſe times thought it neceſſary for them. To deny the conſequence of the propoſition, is to charge the Church with extream folly, wilful ſuperſtition, and perpetual profanation of the Bleſſed Sacrament. As for the Aſſumption, it is fully confirmed by *Clemens Rom. Conſtit. Apoſt.* l. 3. c. 20. *Dionyſius Areopagita de Eccleſ. Hierarch.* cap. ult. S. *Cyprian* and a Council of *African* Biſhops with him, *Epiſt.* 59. *ad Fidum*; and in his Treatiſe *de Lapſis* p. 137. Edit. *Pamel. Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola* in *Italy*, An. 353. in *Epiſt.* 12. *ad Senem*; out of *Ordo Romanus*, cited by *Alevinus* S. *Bedes* Scholar and Maſter to *Charlemain* in his Book *de divinis officiis cap. de Sab. Sancto Paſc. Gennadius Maſſilienſis de Eccleſ. dogmatibus* c. 52. *Concil. Toletanum* 2. Can. 11. It continued in the Weſtern Church, unto the days of *Lewes* the *Debonair*, witneſs *Cardinal Perron des paſſages de S. Auſtin* p. 100. Some footſteps of it remained there in the time of *Hugo de S. Victore*, as you may ſee *lib.* 1. *de Sacram. & Cærem.* cap. 20. It was the practice of the Church of the *Armenians* in *Waldenſis* his time, as he relates out of *Guido* the *Carmelite*, Tom. 2. de *Sacr.* c. 91. *de erroribus Armenorum.* It is ſtill in force in the Church of the *Abyſſines*, witneſs *Franc. Alvarez. Hiſt. Æthiop.* c. 22. *& Thomas a Jeſu de procuranda ſalute omnium gentium.* It has cotinued without any interruption in the *Greek* Church, unto this preſent Age, as may be evidently gathered out of *Lyranus* in c. 6. *John. Arcudius* lib. 1. c. 14. & lib. 3. c. 40. *de concord. Eccleſ. Orient. & Occident. in Sacram. adminiſtratione*; *Card. Perron des paſſages de S. Auſtin.* p. 100. where he alſo aſſures us of the Primitive Church in general, that ſhe gave Infants the Euchariſt as ſoon as they were baptized: and that the cuſtome of giving this Sacrament to little Infants the Church then obſerved: and before p. 21. That in thoſe Ages it was always given to Infants together with Baptiſm. The ſame is likewiſe acknowledged by *Contzen* in *John* 6. *ver.* 54. and by *Thomas a Jeſu de proc. ſalute omnium gentium.* So that this matter of the practice of the Ancient Church is ſufficiently cleared. Seeing therefore the Ancient Church did uſe this Cuſtom, and could have no other ground for it, but

but their belief that this Sacrament was neceſſary for Infants, it follows neceſſarily, that the Church then did believe it neceſſary.

But deductions, though never ſo evident, are ſuperfluous and may be ſet aſide, where there is ſuch abundance of direct and formal Authentical Teſtimonies; whereof ſome ſpeak in *Theſi*, of the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for all men, others in *Hypotheſi*, of the neceſſity of it for Infants.

My Second Argument, from the Teſtimonies of the Fathers of thoſe times I form thus. That Doctrin, in the affirmative whereof the moſt eminent Fathers of the ancient Church agree, and which none of their contemporaries have oppoſed or condemned, ought to be taken for the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of thoſe times.

But the moſt eminent Fathers of the Ancient Church agree in the Affirmation of this Doctrin, that the Euchariſt is neceſſary for Infants; and none of their contemporaries have oppoſed or condemned it. *Ergo*, it ought to be taken for the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of their times. The Major of this Syllogiſm is delivered and fully proved by *Card. Perron*, in his Letter to *Caſaubon* 5. obſ. and is indeed ſo reaſonable a poſtulate, that none but a contentious ſpirit can reject it.

For confirmation of the Minor, I will alledge, firſt, their ſentences, which in Theſi affirm the Euchariſt to be generally neceſſary for all, and therefore for Infants: and then their Suffrages, who in Hypotheſi avouch the neceſſity of it for Infants.

The moſt pregnant Teſtimonies of the firſt rank are theſe: Of *Irænæus* lib. 4. *cont. Hereſ.* c. 34. where he makes our Union to Chriſt by the Euchariſt, the foundation of the hope of our reſurrection, in theſe words. *As the bread of Earth, after the Invocation of God, is now not common bread, but the Euchariſt, conſiſting of two things an earthly and an heavenly: ſo our bodies receiving the Euchariſt, are not now corruptible (for ever) but have hope of reſurrection.* The like he hath, *lib.* 5. *c.* 2. And hence in probability it is, that the *Nicene Council* ſtiled this Sacrament, *Symbolum reſurrectionis*,

ſurrectionis, the pledge of our Reſurrection. And *Ignatius* Ep. ad Eph. *Pharmacum Immortalitatis*, the Medicine of Immortality.

Cyril. Alex. lib. 4. in Joan. *They ſhall never partake, nor ſo much as taſt, the life of holineſs and happineſs, which receive not the Son in the myſtical Benediction.* *Cyril.* lib. 10. in Joan. c. 13. & lib. 11. c. 27. *This corruptible nature of our body, could not otherwiſe be brought to life and immortality, unleſs this body of natural life were conjoyned unto it.* The very ſame things ſaith *Gregory Nyſſen.* Orat. Catech. c. 37. And that they both ſpeak of our conjunction with Chriſt by the Euchariſt, the Antecedents and Conſequents do fully manifeſt, and it is a thing confeſſed by learned Catholicks.

Cyprian de cœna Domini, and *Tertullian de reſur. carnis*, ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe: But I have not their Books by me, and therefore cannot ſet down their words. S. *Chryſoſtom*, Hom. 47. in Joh. on theſe words, *niſi manducaveritis*, has many pregnant and plain ſpeeches to our purpoſe. *As, the words here ſpoken are very terrible: verily, ſaith he, if a man eat not my fleſh, and drink not my blood, he hath no life in him; for whereas they ſaid before, this could not be done, he ſhews it not only not impoſſible, but alſo very neceſſary.* And a little after; *he often iterates his ſpeech concerning the holy myſteries, ſhewing the neceſſity of the thing, and that by all means it muſt be done.* And again, *what means that which he ſays, my fleſh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed; either that this is the true meat that ſaves the ſoul; or to confirm them in the faith of what he had ſpoken, that they ſhould not think he ſpoke Enigmatically, or parabolically, but knew that by all means they muſt eat his body.*

But moſt clear and unanſwerable is that place *lib.* 3. *de Sacerdotio*, where he ſaith, *If a man cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven unleſs he be born again of water and the holy ſpirit; and if he which eats not the fleſh of our Lord and drinks not his blood, is caſt out of eternal life: And all theſe things cannot be done by any other, but only by thoſe holy hands, the hands, I ſay of the Prieſt, how then without their help can any man, either avoid the fire of hell, or obtain the Crowns laid up for us.*

Theophylact. in 6. Joan. *when therefore we hear, that unleſs we eat the fleſh of the Son of man, we cannot have life, we muſt have faith without doubting in the receiving of the divine myſteries, and never inquire how: for the natural man, that is he which followeth humane, that is, natural reaſons, receives not the things which are above nature and ſpiritual; as alſo he underſtands not the ſpiritual meat of the fleſh of our Lord, which they that receive not, ſhall not be partakers of eternal life, as not receiving Jeſus, who is the true life.* S. *Auſtin* de pec. mer. & Remiſ. c. 24. *Very well do the puny Chriſtians call Baptiſm nothing elſe but ſalvation; and the Sacrament of Chriſts Body nothing elſe but Life; from whence ſhould this be, but as I believe from the Ancient and Apoſtolical Tradition, by which this Doctrin is implanted into the Churches of Chriſt, that but by Baptiſm and the participation of the Lords Table, not any man can attain, neither to the Kingdom of God, nor to ſalvation and eternal life.*

Now we are taught by the learned Cardinal; that when the Fathers ſpeak, not as Doctors, but as witneſſes of the Cuſtoms of the Church of their times; and do not ſay, *I believe this ſhould be ſo holden, or ſo underſtood, or ſo obſerved, but that the Church from one end of the earth to the other believes it ſo, or obſerves it ſo*; then we no longer hold what they ſay, for a thing ſaid by them, but as a thing ſaid by the whole Church; and principally when it is in points, whereof they could not be ignorant, either becauſe of the condition of the things, as in matters of fact; or becauſe of the ſufficiency of the perſons: and in this caſe, we argue no more upon their words probably, as we do when they ſpeak in the quality of particular Doctors, but we argue thereupon demonſtratively.

I ſubſume. But S. *Auſtin* the ſufficienteſt perſon which the Church of his time had, ſpeaking of a point, wherein he could not be ignorant; ſays not that I believe the Euchariſt to be neceſſary to ſalvation; but the Churches of Chriſt believe ſo, and have received this doctrin from Apoſtolical Tradition: Therefore I argue upon his words not probably, but demonſtratively, that this was the Catholick doctrin of the Church of his time. And thus much for

for the *Theſis, That the Euchariſt was held generally neceſſary for all.* Now for the *Hypotheſis; That the Euchariſt was held neceſſary for Infants in particular.* Witneſſes hereof are S. *Cyprian,* Pope *Innocentius* I. and *Euſebius Emiſſenus,* with S. *Auſtin* together with the Author of the Book intituled *Hypognoſtica.*

Cyprian indeed does not in terms affirm it, but we have a very clear intimation of it in his Epiſtle to *Fidus.* For whereas he and a Council of Biſhops together with him, had ordered, that Infants might be *baptized* and *ſacrificed,* that is, *communicated* before the eighth day, though that were the day appointed for Circumciſion by the old Law. There he ſets down this as the reaſon of their Decree, *that the mercy and grace of God, was to be denied to no man.*

Pope *Innocent* the firſt, (in *Ep. ad Epiſ. Conc. Milev. quæ eſt inter Auguſt.* 93.) concludes againſt the *Pelagians*; that Infants could not attain eternal life without Baptiſm; becauſe without Baptiſm they were uncapable of the Euchariſt, and without the Euchariſt could not have eternal life. His words are, *but that which your Fraternity affirms them to Preach, that Infants without the grace of Baptiſm may have the rewards of eternal life, is certainly moſt fooliſh; for unleſs they eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his blood; they ſhall have no life in them.*

Now that this ſenſe which I have given his words, is indeed the true ſenſe of them, and that his judgment upon the point was as I have ſaid; it is acknowledged by *Maldonate* in *Joan.* 6. *v.* 54. by *Binius* upon the Councils *Tom.* 1. p. 624. by *Sanctesius, Repet.* 6. c. 7. and it is affirmed by S. *Auſtin* who was his Contemporary, held correſpondence by Letters with him, and therefore in all probability could not be ignorant of his meaning. I ſay he affirms it, as a matter out of Queſtion, Epiſt. 106. and *Cont. Julian.* lib. 1. c. 4. where he tells that *Pelagius* in denying this, did diſpute *contra ſedis Apoſtolicæ authoritatem*; againſt the authority of the Sea Apoſtolick; and after, *but if they yield to the Sea Apoſtolick, or rather to the Maſter himſelf and Lord of the Apoſtles, who ſays, that they ſhall not have life in them, unleſs they*

eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, which none may do but those that are baptized; then at length they will confess, that Infants not baptized cannot have life.

Now I suppose no man will doubt, but the belief of the Apostolick Sea; was then (as S. *Austin* assures us *l.* 1. *cont. Jul. c.* 4.) the belief of the Church of *Rome*, taking it for a particular Church: and then it will presently follow, that either other Churches do not think themselves bound in conformity of belief with the *Roman* Church, notwithstanding *Irenæus* his——*necesse est ad hanc Ecclesiam, omnem convenire Ecclesiam:* or that this was then the Doctrin of the Catholick Church. For *Eusebius Emissenus* I cannot quote any particular proof out of him: but his belief in this point is acknowledged by *Sanctes.* Repet. 6. c. 7. Likewise for S. *Austin*, the same *Sanctesius* and *Binius*, and *Maldonate*, either not mindful or not regardful of the Anathema of the Council of *Trent*, acknowledge (in the places above quoted) that he was also of the same belief: and indeed he professeth it so plainly and so frequently, that he must be a meer stranger to him that knows it not, and very impudent that denies it. *Eucharistiam infantibus putet necessariam Augustinus*, say also the Divines of *Lovaine*, in their *Index* to their Edition of S. *Austin:* and they refer us in their *Index* only to Tom. 2. pag. 185. that is, to the 106. Epist. (the words whereof I have already quoted to shew the meaning of *Innocentius*) and to Tom. 7. pag. 282. that is, lib. 1. *de pec. Mer. & remis.* c. 20. where his words are; *Let then all doubt be taken away: Let us hear our Lord I say, saying not of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, but of the Sacrament of his Table (to which none may lawfully come, but he which has been baptized) unless you eat the flesh of the Son and drink his blood, you shall have no life in you; what seek we any further? what can be answered hereunto? What, will any man dare to say, that this appertains not to little Children, and that without the participation of his body and blood, they may have Life?* &c. with much more to the same effect. Which places are indeed so plain and pregnant for that purpose, that I believe they thought it needless to add more: otherwise had they pleased they might

might have furniſhed their Index with many more referrences to this point; as *de Pec. Mer. & Rem.* l. 1. c. 24. where of Baptiſm and the Euchariſt he tells us, that *Salus & vita eterna ſine his fruſtra promittitur parvulis.* The ſame he has *Cont.* 2. *Epiſt. Pelag. ad Bonifacium* l. 1. c. 22. which yet by *Gratian de Conſec. D.* 3. *c. Nulli.* and by *Tho. Aquinas p.* 3. *q.* 3. *art.* 9. *ad tertiam* is ſtrangely corrupted and made to ſay the contrary, and *l.* 4. *c.* 4. the ſame *Cont. Julian. l.* 1. *c.* 4. and *l.* 3. *c.* 11. & 12. *Cont. Pelag. & Celeſt.* l. 2. c. 8. *de Prædeſt. Sanctorum ad Proſp. & Hilar. l.* 1. *cap.* 14. Neither doth he retract or contradict this opinion any where, nor mitigate any one of his ſentences touching this matter, in his Book of *Retractations. Sanctesius* indeed tells us, that he ſeems to have departed from his Opinion, in his works againſt the *Donatiſts.* But I would he had ſhewed ſome probable reaſon to make it ſeem ſo to others; which ſeeing he does not, we have reaſon to take time to believe him. For as touching the place mentioned by *Beda* in 1. *ad Corinth.* 10. as taken out of a Sermon of S. *Auſtins, ad infantes ad Altare.* Beſides that it is very ſtrange S. *Auſtin* ſhould make a Sermon to Infants; and that there is no ſuch Sermon extant in his works; nor any memory of any ſuch in *Poſſidius,* S. *Auſtins* Scholars Catalogue of his works, nor in his Book of *Retractaitons*: ſetting aſide all this, I ſay Firſt, That it is no way certain that he ſpeaks there of Infants, ſeeing in propriety of ſpeech (as S. *Auſtin* himſelf teacheth us *Ep.* 23) Infants were not *Fideles,* of whom S. *Auſtin* in that ſuppoſed Sermon ſpeaks. Secondly, Admit he does ſpeak of Infants, where he aſſures us, that in Baptiſm every faithful man is made partaker of Chriſts body and blood, and that he ſhall not be alienated from the benefit of the Bread and Cup, although he depart this life, before he eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup. All this concludes no more, but that the actual participation of the Euchariſt, is not a means ſimply neceſſary to attain ſalvation, ſo that no impoſſibility ſhall excuſe the failing of it: Whereas all that I aim at is but this, that in the judgment of the Ancient Church, it was believed neceſſary, in caſe of poſſibility; neceſſary, not

in

in actu, but *in voto Ecclesiæ*: not necessary to salvation simply, but necessary for the increase of grace and glory: And therefore, Lastly, though not necessary by *necessity of means*, for Infants to receive it; yet necessary by *necessity of precepts* for the Church to give it.

The last witness I promised, was the Author of the work against the *Pelagians* called *Hypognostica*, who (*l.* 5. *c.* 5.) ask the *Pelagians*, *Seeing he himself hath said, unless you eat the flesh*, &c. *How dare you promise eternal life to little Children, not regenerate of water and the Holy Ghost; not having eaten his flesh, nor drank his blood.* And a little after, *Behold then, he that is not Baptized, and he that is destitute of the Bread and Cup of life, is separated from the Kingdom of Heaven.*

To the same purpose he speaks *l.* 6. *c.* 6. But it is superfluous to recite his words, for either this is enough or nothing.

The third kind of proof, whereby I undertook to shew the belief of the ancient Church in this point, was the *Confession of the learnedest Writers and best verst in the Church of* Rome. Who, what the Council of *Trent* forbids under Anathema, that any man should say of any ancient Father, are not yet afraid, nor make no scruple, to say it in plain terms of the whole Church for many Ages together, *viz.* That she believed the Eucharist necessary for Infants. So doth *Maldonate* in *Joan.* 6. *Mitto Augustini & Innocentii sententiam (quæ etiam viguit in Ecclesia per sexcentos annos) Eucharistiam etiam Infantibus necessariam.* I *say nothing* says he, of *Austins* and *Innocentius* his opinion, *that the Eucharist was necessary even for Infants, which doctrin flourished in the* Church for 600. years.

The same almost in terms hath *Binius*, in his Notes on the Councils, pag. 624. *Hinc constat Innocentii sententia (quæ sexcentos circiter annos viguit in Ecclesiâ, quam Augustinus sectatus est) Eucharistiam etiam infantibus necessariam fuisse.*

Lastly, That treasury of Antiquity Cardinal *Perron*, though he speaks not so home as the rest do, yet he says enough for my purpose: *des passages de S. August.* c. 10. p. 101.

p. 101. *The Cuſtom of giving the Euchariſt to Infants the Church then obſerved as profitable.* This I ſay is enough for my purpoſe. For what more contradictious, than the Euchariſt being the ſame without alteration to Infants being the ſame without alteration, ſhould then be profitable and now unprofitable: then all things conſidered expedient to be uſed, if not neceſſary, and therefore commanded: And now, though there be no variety in the caſe, all things conſidered not neceſſary, nor expedient, and therefore forbidden.

The Iſſue of all this Diſcourſe, for ought I can ſee, muſt be this: That either both parts of a Contradiction muſt be true, and conſequently nothing can be falſe, ſeeing that which contradicteth truth is not ſo: or elſe, that the Ancient Church did err in believing ſomething expedient which was not ſo; (and if ſo, why may not the preſent Church err, in thinking *Latin*-Service, and Communion in one kind expedient:) or that the preſent Church doth err, in thinking ſomething not expedient, which is ſo. And if ſo, why may ſhe not err, in thinking Communicating the Laity in both kinds, and Service in vulgar Languages, not expedient.

V. *An Argument drawn from the Doctrin of the Millenaries, againſt Infallibility.*

THE Doctrin of the *Millenaries* was, *That before the worlds end, Chriſt ſhould reign upon earth for a thouſand years, and that the Saints ſhould live under him in all holineſs and happineſs.* That this Doctrin is by the preſent *Roman* Church held falſe and Heretical, I think no man will deny.

That the ſame Doctrin, was by the Church of the next Age after the Apoſtles held true and Catholick I prove by theſe two Reaſons.

The firſt Reaſon, Whatſoever doctrin is believed and taught by the moſt eminent Fathers of any Age of the Church, and by none of their contemporaries oppoſed or condemned, that is to be eſteemed the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of thoſe times.

But the Doctrin of the *Millenaries* was believed and taught by the eminent Fathers of the Age next after the Apoſtles, and by none of that Age oppoſed or condemned.

Therefore it was the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of thoſe times. The Propoſition of this Syllogiſm is Cardinal *Perrons* rule, (in his Epiſtle to *Caſaubon*, 5. obſerv.) And is indeed one of the main pillars, upon which the great Fabrick of his Anſwer to King *James* doth ſtand, and with which it cannot but fall; and therefore I will ſpend no time in the proof of it.

But the Aſſumption thus I prove.

That Doctrin which was believed and taught by *Papias* Biſhop of *Hierapolis*, the diſciple of the Apoſtles diſciples (according to *Euſebius*) who lived in the times of the Apoſtles, ſaith he, by *Juſtin Martyr*, Doctor of the Church and Martyr: by *Melito* Biſhop of *Sardis*, who had the gift of Propheſie, witneſs *Tert.* and whom *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth a Saint. By S. *Irenæus* Biſhop of *Lyons* and Martyr; and was not oppoſed and condemned by any one Doctor

Doctor of the Church of thoſe times: That Doctrine was believed and taught by the moſt Eminent Fathers of that Age, next to the Apoſtles, and oppoſed by none.

But the former part of the Propoſition is true. *Ergo*, the Latter is alſo true.

The Major of this Syllogiſm and the latter part of the Minor, I ſuppoſe will need no proof, with them that conſider, that theſe here mentioned were equal in number to all the other Eccleſiaſtical Writers of that Age, of whom there is any memory remaining; and in weight and worth infinitely beyond them: they were *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus Antiochenus*, *Egeſippus* and *Hippolitus*: of whoſe contradiction to this Doctrine there is not extant, neither in their works, nor in ſtory, any Print or Foot-ſtep: which if they or any of them had oppoſed, it had been impoſſible, conſidering the Eccleſiaſtical Story of their time is Written by the profeſſed Enemies of the Millinaries Doctrine; who could they have found any thing in the monuments of Antiquity to have put in the Ballance againſt *Juſtin Martyr* and *Irenæus*, no doubt would not have buried it in ſilence: which yet they do, neither vouching for their opinion any one of more Antiquity than *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, who lived, ſaith *Euſebius*, *noſtra ætate*, [in our Age] but certainly in the latter part of the third Century. For *Tatianus* becauſe an Heretick I reckon not in this number. And if any man ſay that before his fall he wrote many Books; I ſay, it is true; but withal would have it remembred, that he was *Juſtin Martyrs* Scholar, and therefore, in all probability of his Maſters Faith, rather than againſt it, all that is extant of him one way or other is but this in S. *Hierome*, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Juſtini Martyris *ſectator fuit.*

Now for the other part of the Minor, that the forementioned Fathers did believe and teach this Doctrine. And firſt for *Papias* that he taught it, it is confeſſed by *Euſebius* the Enemy of this Doctrine (*Lib.* 3. *Hiſt. Eccleſ. c.* 33.) in theſe words, — *Other things beſides the ſame Author* (Papias) *declares, that they came to him as it were by unwritten Tradition, wherein he affirms that after the Reſur-*

rection of all Fleſh from the Dead, there ſhall be a Kingdom of Chriſt continued and eſtabliſhed for a thouſand years upon Earth, after a humane and corporeal manner. The ſame is confeſſed by S. *Hierome*, another Enemy to this opinion, (*deſcript. Eccleſ. S.* 29.) Papias *the Auditor of* John *Biſhop of* Hieropolis *is ſaid to have taught the Judaical Tradition of a thouſand years, whom* Irenæus *and* Apollinarius *followed.* And in his preface upon the Commentaries of *Victorinus* upon the *Apocalypſe*, thus he writes, — *before him* Papias *Biſhop of* Hieropolis *and* Nepos *Biſhop in the parts of* Egypt *taught as* Victorinus *does touching the Kingdom of the thouſand years.*

The ſame is teſtified by *Irenæus* (*lib.* 5. *cont. Her. c.* 33.) where having at large ſet forth this Doctrine, he confirms it by the Authority of *Papias* in theſe words. Papias *alſo the Auditor of* John, *the familiar friend of* Policarpus *an Ancient man, hath teſtified by writing theſe things in the fourth of his Books, for he hath writtten five.* And concerning *Papias* thus much.

That *Juſtin Martyr* was of the ſame belief, it is confeſſed by *Sixtus Senenſis* (*Biblioth. Stæ. l.* 6. *An.* 347.) by *Feverdentius* in his premonition before the five laſt Chapters of the 5th. Book of *Irenæus.* By *Pamelius* in *Antidoto ad Tertul. parad. paradox.* 14.

That S. *Melito* Biſhop of *Sardis* held the ſame Doctrine is confeſſed by *Pamelius* in the ſame place; and thereupon it is that *Gennadius Maſſilienſis* in his Book *de Eccleſ. dogmatibus*, calls the followers of this opinion *Melitani*; as the ſame *Pamelius* teſtifies in his Notes upon that fragment of *Tertullian de Spe fidelium.*

Irenæus his Faith in this point is likewiſe confeſſed by *Euſebius*, in the place before quoted in theſe words. *He* (Papias) *was the Author of the like Error to moſt of the Writers of the Church, who alledged the Antiquity of the Man for a defence of their ſide, as to* Irenæus *and whoſoever elſe ſeemed to be of the ſame opinion with him.*

By S. *Hierome* in the place above cited *de ſcript. Eccleſ. S.* 29. Again in *Lib. Ezek.* 11. in theſe words. *For neither do we expect from Heaven a Golden* Hieruſalem (*according to the Jewiſh tales which they call* Duteroſſis) *which alſo*

ſo many of our own have followed: *Eſpecially* Tertullian *in his Book* de ſpe fidelium; *and* Lactantius *in his ſeventh Book of Inſtitutions, and the frequent expoſitions of* Victorinus Pictavionenſis: *and of late* Severus *in his Dialogue which he calls* Gallus: *and to name the* Greeks *and to joyn together the firſt and laſt,* Irenæus *and* Apollinarius. Where we ſee he acknowledges *Irenæus* to be of this opinion; but that he was the firſt that held it, I believe that that is more a Chriſtian untruth than *Irenæus* his opinion a Judaical Fable. For he himſelf acknowledges in the place above cited, that *Irenæus* followed *Papias*; and it is certain and confeſſed that *Juſtin Martyr* believed it long before him: and *Irenæus* himſelf derives it from —— *Preſbyteri qui* Johannem *diſcipulum Domini viderunt*; from Prieſts which ſaw *John* the Diſciple of the Lord. Laſtly, by *Pamelius, Sixtus Senenſis,* and *Faverdentius* in the places above quoted.

Seeing therefore it is certain, even to the confeſſion of the Adverſaries, that *Papias, Juſtin Martyr, Meleto* and *Irenæus,* the moſt conſiderable and eminent men of their Age, did believe and teach this Doctrine; and ſeeing it has been proved as evidently as a thing of this nature can be, that none of their contemporaries oppoſed or condemned it; It remains according to Cardinal *Perrons* firſt rule; that this is to be eſteemed the Doctrine of the Church of that Age.

My ſecond Reaſon I form thus. Whatſoever Doctrine is taught by the Fathers of any Age, not as Doctors but as witneſſes of the Tradition of the Church, (that is, not as their own opinion, but as the Doctrine of the Church of their times) that is undoubtedly to be ſo eſteemed; eſpecially if none contradicted them in it. But the Fathers above cited teach this Doctrine, not as their own private opinion, but as the Chriſtian Tradition, and as the Doctrine of the Church, neither did any contradict them in it. *Ergo,* it is undoubtedly to be ſo eſteemed.

The Major of this Syllogiſm, is Cardinal *Perrons* ſecond Rule and way of finding out the Doctrine of the Ancient Church in any Age: and if it be not a ſure Rule, farewel the uſe of all Antiquity.

And for the *Minor*, there will be little doubt of it, to him that conſiders, that *Papias* profeſſes himſelf to have received this Doctrine by unwritten Tradition, though not from the Apoſtles themſelves immediately, yet from their Scholars, as appears by *Euſebius* in the forecited third Book 33. Chapter.

That *Irenæus* grounding it upon evident Scripture, profeſſes that he learnt it, (whether mediately or immediately I cannot tell) from (*a*) *Presbyteri qui* Johannem *Diſcipulum Domini viderunt.* Prieſts or Elders who ſaw *John* the Lords Diſciple, and heard of him what our Lord taught of thoſe times (of the thouſand years) and alſo, as he ſays after, from *Papias* the Auditor of *John* the Chamberfellow of *Polycarpus*, an Ancient man who recorded it in writing.

(*a*) *Faverdentius* his Note upon this place is very Notable. *Hinc apparet* (ſaith he) from hence it appears that *Irenæus* neither firſt invented this opinion, nor held it as proper to himſelf, but got this blot and blemiſh from certain Fathers. *Papias* I ſuppoſe and ſome other inglorious fellows, the familiar Friends of *Irenæus*, are here intended.

I hope then if the Fathers which lived with the Apoſtles had their blots and blemiſhes; it is no ſuch horrid Crime for *Calvin* and the *Century writers* to impute the ſame to their great Grandchildren. *Ætas parentum pejor avis progeniem fert vitioſiorem.* But yet theſe inglorious Diſciples of the Apoſtles, though perhaps not ſo learned as *Faverdentius*, were yet certainly ſo honeſt, as not to invent lies and deliver them as Apoſtolick Tradition; or if they were not, what confidence can we place in any other unwritten Tradition.

Laſtly, that *Juſtin Martyr* grounds it upon plain Prophecies of the *Old Teſtament*, and expreſs words of the *New*: he profeſſeth, *That he, and all other Chriſtians of a right belief in all things, believe it*; joyns them who believe it not, with them who deny the Reſurrection; or elſe ſays, that none denied this, but the ſame who denied the Reſurrection; and that indeed they were called Chriſtians, but in deed and Truth were none.

Whoſo-

Whoſoever, I ſay, conſiders theſe things will eaſily grant, that they held it not as their own opinion, but as the Doctrine of the Church and the Faith of Chriſtians.

Hereupon I conclude, whatſoever they held, not as their private opinion, but as the Faith of the Church, that was the Faith of the Church of their time: But this Doctrine they held, not as *their* private opinion, but as the Faith of the Church. *Ergo*, it was and is to be eſteemed the Faith of the Church.

Trypho. "Do ye confeſs that before ye expect the "coming of Chriſt, this place *Hieruſalem* ſhall be again "reſtored, and that your People ſhall be congregated, and "rejoyce together with Chriſt, and the Patriarchs and "the Prophets, *&c.*

Juſtin Martyr. "I have confeſſed to you before, that "both I and many others do believe, as you well know, "that this ſhall be; but that many again, who are (not) "of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians, do not "acknowledge this, I have alſo ſignified unto you: "For I have declared unto you, that ſome called Chriſtians, "but being indeed *Atheiſts* and impious *Hereticks*, do gene-"rally teach blaſphemous and Atheiſtical and fooliſh things: "but that you might know that I ſpeak not this to you on-"ly, I will make a Book as near as I can of theſe our diſ-"putations, where I will profeſs in writing that which I "ſay before you; for I reſolve to follow not men, and the "Doctrines of men, but God and the Doctrine of God. "For although you chance to meet with ſome that are "called Chriſtians, which do not confeſs this, but dare "to Blaſpheme the God of *Abraham*, the God of *Iſaac*, and "the God of *Jacob*, which alſo ſay there is no Reſurrecti-"on of the Dead, but that as ſoon as they die their Souls "are received into Heaven, do not ye yet think them "Chriſtians: as neither if a man conſider rightly will he "account the Sadducees and other Sectaries and Hereticks, "as the *Geniſtæ* and the *Meriſtæ* and *Galileans*, and *Phariſees* "and *Hellenians* and *Baptiſts* and other ſuch to be *Jews*; but "only that they are called *Jews*, and the Children of *Abra-*"*ham*, and ſuch as with their lips confeſs God (as God "himſelf

"himſelf cries out) but have their Hearts far from him. "But I and all Chriſtians that in all things believe aright, "both know that there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the "Fleſh, and a thouſand years in *Hieruſalem* reſtored and "adorned and inlarged; according as the Prophets, *Ezekiel* "and *Eſay* and others do teſtifie: for thus ſaith *Iſaiah* of "the time of this thouſand years. *For there ſhall be a new* "*Heaven and a new Earth, and they ſhall not remember the former*, &c. And after. —— "A certain man amongſt us "whoſe name was *John*, one of the Twelve Apoſtles of "Chriſt, in that *Revelation* which was exhibited unto him, "hath foretold — That they which believe our Chriſt "ſhall live in *Hieruſalem* a thouſand years, and that after, "the Univerſal and everlaſting Reſurrection and Judgment "ſhall be.

I have preſumed in the beginning of *Juſtin Martyrs* anſwer to ſubſtitute (not) inſtead of (alſo) becauſe I am confident, that either by chance, or the fraud of ſome ill-willers to the Millinaries opinion; the place has been corrupted, and (καὶ) turned into (οὐ) (not) into (alſo.) For if we retain the uſual reading—— *But that many who are alſo of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians do not acknowledge this, I have alſo ſignified unto you*; then muſt we conclude, that *Juſtin Martyr* himſelf did believe the opinion of them which denied the thouſand years, to be the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians: and if ſo, why did he not himſelf believe it? nay how could he but believe it to be true, profeſſing it (as he does if the place be right) to be the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians: for how a falſe Doctrine can be the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians, what Chriſtian can conceive? or if it may be ſo, how can the contrary avoid the being untrue, unholy and not the opinion of Chriſtians?

Again, if we read the place thus —— *That many who are alſo of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians, do not acknowledge this, I have alſo ſignified*: certainly there will be neither ſenſe nor reaſon, neither coherence nor conſequence in the words following—— *For I have told you of many called Chriſtians, but being indeed Atheiſts and Hereticks,*

reticks, that they altogether teach blaſphemous and impious and fooliſh things: for how is this a confirmation or reaſon of, or any way pertinent unto what went before? if there he ſpeak of none but ſuch as were, *puræ piæque Chriſtianorum ſententiæ*, of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians. And therefore to diſguiſe this inconſequence, the Tranſlator has thought fit to make uſe of a falſe Tranſlation, and inſtead of——*for I have told you*, to make it, —— *beſides I have told you of many*, &c. Again, if *Juſtin Martyr* had thought this *the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians*, or them good and holy Chriſtians that held it; why does he rank them with them that denyed the Reſurrection? Why does he ſay afterward — *Although you chance to meet with ſome that are called Chriſtians which do not confeſs this, do not ye think them Chriſtians.* Laſtly, what ſenſe is there in ſaying as he does——*I and all Chriſtians that are of a right belief in all things, believe the Doctrine of the thouſand years*, and that the Scriptures both of the *Old* and *New Teſtament* teach it, and yet ſay ——*That many of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians do not believe it?* Upon theſe reaſons I ſuppoſe it is evident, that the place has been corrupted, and it is to be corrected according as I have corrected it, by ſubſtituting τ in the place of οὐ (not) inſtead of (alſo.) Neither need any man think ſtrange that this misfortune of the change of a Syllable ſhould befal this place, who conſiders that in this place *Juſtin Martyr* tells us that he had ſaid the ſame things before, whereas nothing to this purpoſe appears now in him. And that in *Victorinus* comment on the *Revelation*, wherein, (by S. *Hieroms* acknowledgment) this Doctrine was ſtrongly maintained, there now appears nothing at all for it, but rather againſt it. And now from the place thus reſtored, theſe Obſervations offer themſelves unto us.

1. That *Juſtin Martyr* ſpeaks not as a Doctor, but as a witneſs of the Doctrine of the Church of his time. I (ſaith he) and all Chriſtians that are of a right belief in all things hold this: And therefore from hence according to Cardinal *Perrons* Rule, we are to conclude, not probably but demonſtratively, that this was the Doctrine of the Church of that time.

2. That

2. That they held it as a neceſſary matter, ſo far as to hold them no Chriſtians that held the Contrary: *though you chance to meet with ſome called Chriſtians that do not confeſs this, but dare to Blaſpheme the God of* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Jacob, *&c. Yet do not ye think them Chriſtians*: Now if *Bellarmines* Rule be true, that Councils then determine any thing as matters of Faith, when they pronounce them Hereticks that hold the Contrary; then ſure *Juſtin Martyr* held this Doctrine as a matter of Faith, ſeeing he pronounceth them no Chriſtians, that contradict it.

3. That the Doctrine is grounded upon the Scripture of the *Old* and *New Teſtament* and the *Revelation* of S. *John*, and that by a Doctor and Martyr, of the Church, and ſuch a one as was converted to Chriſtianity within 30 years after the Death of S. *John*, when in all probability there were many alive, that had heard him expound his own words and teach this Doctrine: and if probabilities will not be admitted, this is certain out of the moſt authentical records of the Church, that *Papias* the Diſciple of the Apoſtles Diſciples taught it the Church, profeſſing that he had received it from them that learned it from the Apoſtles: and if after all this, the Church of thoſe Times might Err in a Doctrine ſo clearly derived and authentically delivered, how without extream impudence can any Church in after times, pretend to Infallibility.

The *Millinaries* Doctrine was over-born, by imputing to them that which they held not: by abrogating the Authority of S. *John's* Revelation, as ſome did: or by derogating from it, as others; aſcribing it not to S. *John* the Apoſtle, but to ſome other *John*, they know not who: which —— *Dionyſius* the firſt known adverſary of this doctrine and his followers; againſt the Tradition of *Irenæus*, *Juſtin Martyr*, and all the Fathers their Anteceſſors: by calling it a Judaical opinion and yet allowing it as probable by corrupting the Authors for it, as *Juſtin*, *Victorinus*, *Severus*.

VI. *A Letter relating to the ſame Subject.*

SIR,

I Pray remember, that if a conſent of Fathers either conſtitute or declare a Truth to be neceſſary, or ſhew the opinion of the Church of their Time; then that opinion of the Jeſuits, concerning Predeſtination upon preſcience (which had no oppoſer before S. *Auſtin*) muſt be ſo, and the contrary Heretical of the Dominicans; and the preſent Church differs from the Ancient, in not eſteeming of it as they did.

Secondly, I pray remember, that if the Fathers be infallible, (when they ſpeak as witneſſes of Tradition) to ſhew the opinion of the Church of their Time, then the opinion of the *Chiliaſts* (which now is a Hereſie in the Church of *Rome*) was once Tradition in the Opinion of the Church.

Thirdly, Since S. *Auſtin* had an opinion, that of whatſoever no beginning was known, that came from the Apoſtles, many Fathers might ſay things to be Tradition upon that ground only; but of this Opinion of the *Chiliaſts*, one of the ancienteſt Fathers *Irenæus* ſays not onely that it was Tradition, but ſets down Chriſts own words when he taught it, and the pedigree of the opinion from Chriſt * to *John* his Diſciple; from him to ſeveral Prieſts (whereof *Papias* was one who put it in writing) and ſo downwards; which can be ſhewn from no other Father, for no other opinion, either controverted, or uncontroverted.

Faverdent. Edit. Iren. *p.* 497.

Fourthly, That if *Papias* either by his own error, or a deſire to deceive, could cozen the Fathers of the pureſt age in this, why not alſo in other things? why not in twenty as well as one, why not twenty others as well as he.

Fifthly, That if the Fathers could be cozened, how could general Councils ſcape? who you ſay make Tradition one of their Rules, which can only be known from the Fathers?

Sixthly, If they object, how could errors come in, and no beginning of them known? I pray remember to ask them the ſame Queſtion concerning the *Millenaries*, which laſted uncontradicted, until *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* two hundred and fifty years after Chriſt; and if they tell you that *Papias* was the firſt beginner, look in *Irenæus*, and he will tell you the contrary. (*Loco citato* l. 5. c. 33.)

Seventhly, Remember, that if I ought not to condemn the Church of *Rome* out of Scripture, becauſe my interpretation may deceive me; then they ought not to build their Infallibility upon it (and leſs upon her own word) becauſe theirs may deceive them: unleſs the ſame thing may be a wall when you lean upon it, and a bulruſh when we do.

Eighthly, Remember that they cannot ſay, they truſt not their Interpretation in this, but a conſent of Fathers; becauſe the Fathers are not ſaid to be infallible, but as they tell the Opinion of the Church of their time, which is infallible: therefore they muſt firſt prove out of Scripture that ſhe is infallible, or elſe ſhe (who is her ſelf the ſubject of the Queſtion) cannot be allowed till then to give a verdict for her ſelf.

Ninthly, Remember the *Roman* Church claims no Notes of the Church, but what agree with the *Grecian* too (as Antiquity, Succeſſion, Miracles, &c.) but onely Communion with the Pope and Splendor; both which made for the *Arrians* in *Liberius* his time; and it were a hard Caſe, that becauſe the *Greeks* are poor upon Earth, they ſhould be ſhut out of Heaven.

Tenthly, Remember that if we have an Infallible way, we have no uſe (at leaſt no neceſſity) of an Infallible Guide; for if we may be ſaved by following the Scripture as near as we can (though we err) it is as good as any Interpreter to keep unity in charity (which is only needful) though not in opinion: and this cannot be ridiculous, becauſe they ſay, if any man miſinterpret the Council of *Trent*, it ſhall not damn him; and why (without more ado) may not the ſame be ſaid of Scripture?

VII. *An*

VII. *An Argument againſt the Infallibility of the preſent Church of* Rome, *taken from the Contradictions in your Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation.*

Chillingworth. THat Church is not infallible, which teacheth Contradictions: But the Church of *Rome* teacheth Contradictions. Therefore the Church of *Rome* is not infallible.

Mr. *Daniel.* I deny the Minor.

Chilling. That Church teacheth Contradictions, which teacheth ſuch a Doctrin as contains Contradictions: But the Church of *Rome* teacheth ſuch a Doctrin: Therefore the Church of *Rome* teacheth Contradictions.

Mr. *Daniel.* I deny the Minor.

Chilling. The Doctrin of Tranſubſtantion contains Contradictions: But the Church of *Rome* teacheth the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation: Therefore the Church of *Rome* teacheth ſuch a Doctrin as contains Contradictions.

Mr. *Dan.* I deny the Major.

Chilling. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould have the true figure of a mans body, and ſhould not have the true figure of a mans body, is a Contradiction: But in the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation it is taught, that the ſame thing, (*viz.* our Saviour preſent in the Sacrament) has the true figure of a mans body, and has not the true figure of a mans body at the ſame time; therefore the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation contains Contradictions.

Mr. *Dan.* The Major, though not having all rules required to a contradiction (as boys in Logick know) yet let it paſs.

Chilling. Boys in Logick know no more conditions required to a Contradiction, but that the ſame thing ſhould be affirmed and denied of the ſame thing at the ſame time. For my meaning was, that that ſhould not be accounted the ſame thing, which was conſidered after divers manners.

Mr. *Dan.* I deny the Minor of your ſyllogiſm.

Chilling. I prove it, according to the ſeveral parts of it: And firſt, for the firſt part. He muſt have the Figure of a mans body in the Euchariſt, who is there without any real alteration or difference from the natural body of a man: But our Saviour, according to the *Romiſh* Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, is in the Sacrament without any real alteration or difference from the natural body of a man: Therefore according to this Doctrin he muſt there have the figure of a mans body. To the ſecond part, that he muſt not have the figure of a mans body in the Sacrament, according to this Doctrin, thus I prove it. He muſt not have the figure of a mans body in the Euchariſt, which muſt not have extenſion there: But our Saviours body, according to the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, muſt not have extenſion there; Therefore, according to this doctrin, he muſt not have the figure of a mans body there. The Major of this Syllogiſm I proved, becauſe the figure of a mans body could not be without extenſion. The Minor I proved thus; That muſt not have extenſion in the Euchariſt, whoſe every part is together in one and the ſame point: But according to this Doctrin, every part of our Saviours body muſt be here in one and the ſame point: therefore here it muſt not have extenſion.

Mr. *Dan.* Anſwered, by diſtinguiſhing the Major of the firſt Syllogiſm, and ſaid; that he muſt not have the true figure of a mans body, according to the reaſon of a figure taken in its eſſential conſideration, which is to have *poſitionem partium ſic & ſic extra partes*; but not the accidental conſideration, which is in *ordine ad locum*. And this anſwer he applied for the ſolution of the Minor, ſaying thus, Our Saviour is there without any real alteration intrinſecal, but not extrinſecal; for he is not changed in order to himſelf, but in order to place: Or otherwiſe, he is not altered in his continual exiſtence, which is only *modus eſſentiæ* and inſeparable even by divine power, though altered *in modo exiſtendi*, which is ſituation and required to figure taken in order to place.

Chilling.

Chill. Againſt this it was replied by *Chillingworth*: That the diſtinction of a mans body as conſidered in it ſelf, and as conſidered in reference to place, is vain, and no ſolution of the Argument: And thus he proved it; If it be impoſſible, that any thing ſhould have ſeveral parts one out of another in order, and reference of each to other, without having theſe parts in ſeveral places; then the diſtinction is vain: But it is impoſſible, that any thing ſhould have ſeveral parts one out of another, without having theſe parts in ſeveral places; Therefore the diſtinction is vain.

The Major of this Syllogiſm he took for granted.

The Minor he proved thus: Whatſoever body is in the proper place of another body, muſt of neceſſity be in that very body, by poſſeſſing the demenſions of it: therefore, whatſoever hath ſeveral parts one out of the other, muſtof neceſſity have them one out of the place of the other; and conſequently in ſeveral places.

For illuſtration of this Argument he ſaid; If my head and belly and thighs and legs be all in the very ſame place; of neceſſity my head muſt be in my belly, and my belly in my thighs, and my thighs in my legs, and all of them in my feet, and my feet in all of them; and therefore if my head be out of my belly, it muſt be out of the place where my belly is; and if it be not out of the place where my belly is, it is not out of my belly but in it.

Again, to ſhew that according to the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, our Saviours body in the Euchariſt hath not the ſeveral parts of it out of one another, he diſputed thus: Whereſoever there is a body having ſeveral parts [illegible] of the other, there muſt be ſome middle parts [illegible] the extreme parts: But here, according to this Doctrin, the extreme parts are not ſevered, but altogether in the ſame point; Therefore here our Saviours Body cannot have parts one out of other.

Mr. *Dan.* To all this (for want of a better Anſwer) gave only this. *Let all Scholars peruſe theſe.* After, upon better conſideration, he wrote by the ſide of the laſt Syllogiſm this: *Quoad entitatem verum eſt, non quoad locum*, that is, according to entity it is true, but not according to place.

place. And to (*Let all Scholars peruſe theſe*) he cauſed this to be added; *And weigh whether there is any new matter*, worth a new Anſwer.

Chillingworth Replyed, That to ſay the extreme parts of a body are ſevered by the middle parts according to their entity, but not according to place, is ridiculous. His reaſons are firſt, Becauſe ſevering of things is nothing elſe, but putting or keeping them in ſeveral places, as every ſilly woman knows; and therefore to ſay, they are ſevered but not according to place, is as if you ſhould ſay, They are heated, but not according to heat; they are cooled, but not according to cold: Indeed is it to ſay, they are ſevered, but not ſevered.

VIII. *An account of what moved the Author to turn a Papiſt, with his own Confutation of the Arguments that perſwaded him thereto.*

I Reconciled my ſelf to the Church of *Rome*, becauſe I thought my ſelf to have ſufficient reaſon to believe, that there was and muſt be always in the World ſome Church, that could not err: and conſequently ſeeing all other Churches diſclaimed this priviledge of not being ſubject to error; the Church of *Rome* muſt be that Church which cannot err.

I was put into doubt of this way which I had choſen, by D. *Stapleton* and others; who limit the Churches freedom from Error to things neceſſary only, and ſuch as without which the Church can be a Church no longer, but granted it ſubject to error in things that were not neceſſary: Hereupon conſidering that moſt of the differences between *Proteſtants* and *Roman* Catholicks; were not touching things neceſſary, but only profitable or lawful; I concluded, that I had not ſufficient ground to believe the *Roman* Church either could not or did not err in any thing, and therefore no ground to be a *Roman* Catholick.

Againſt

Againſt this again I was perſwaded, that it was not ſufficient to believe the Church to be an *infallible believer* of all doctrins neceſſary; but it muſt alſo be granted an *infallible teacher* of what is neceſſary; that is, that we muſt believe not only that the Church teacheth all things neceſſary, but that all is neceſſary to be believed, which the Church teacheth to be ſo: in effect, that the Church is our Guide in the way to Heaven.

Now to believe that the Church was an infallible Guide, and to be believed in all things which ſhe requires us to believe, I was induced: Firſt, becauſe there was nothing that could reaſonably conteſt with the Church about this Office, but the Scripture: and that the Scripture was this Guide, I was willing to believe, but that I ſaw not how it could be made good, without depending upon the Churches authority.

1. That Scripture is the Word of God.
2. That the Scripture is a perfect rule of our duty.
3. That the Scripture is ſo plain in thoſe things that concern our duty, that whoſoever deſires and endeavors to find the will of God, there ſhall either find it, or at leaſt not dangerouſly miſtake it.

Secondly, I was drawn to this belief, becauſe I conceived that it was evident, out of the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, that there muſt be unto the worlds end a Succeſſion of Paſtors, by adhering to whom, men might be kept from wavering in matters of faith, and from being carried up and down with every wind of falſe doctrin.

That no Succeſſion of Paſtors could guard their adherents from danger of error, if themſelves were ſubject unto error, either in teaching that to be neceſſary which is not ſo, or denying that to be neceſſary which is ſo: and therefore,

That there was and muſt be ſome Succeſſion of Paſtors, which was an infallible guide in the way to Heaven; and which ſhould not poſſibly teach any thing to be neceſſary which was not ſo; nor any thing not neceſſary which was ſo: upon this ground I concluded, that ſeeing there muſt be ſuch a Succeſſion of Paſtors, as was an infallible guide;

and

and there was no other (but that of the Church of *Rome*) even by the confeſſion of all other Societies of Paſtors in the world; that therefore that Succeſſion of Paſtors is that infallible Guide of Faith which all men muſt follow.

Upon theſe grounds I thought it neceſſary for my ſalvation, to believe the *Roman* Church, in all that ſhe thought to be, and propoſed as neceſſary.

Againſt theſe Arguments it hath been demonſtrated unto me; and Firſt againſt the firſt. That the reaſon why we are to believe the Scripture to be the word of God, neither is nor can be the Authority of the preſent Church of *Rome*, which cannot make good her Authority any other way, but by pretence of Scripture: and therefore ſtands not unto Scripture (no not in reſpect of us) in the relation of a Foundation to a building, but of a building to a Foundation, doth not ſupport Scripture, but is ſupported by it. But the general conſent of Chriſtians of all Nations and Ages, a far greater company than that of the Church of *Rome*, and delivering univerſally the Scripture for the word of God, is the ordinary external reaſon why we believe it; whereunto the Teſtimonies of the Jews, enemies of Chriſt, add no ſmall moment for the Authority of ſome part of it.

That whatſoever ſtood upon the ſame ground of Univerſal Tradition with Scripture, might juſtly challenge belief, as well as Scripture: but that no Doctrin not written in Scripture, could juſtly pretend to as full Tradition as the Scripture, and therefore we had no reaſon to believe it with that degree of faith, wherewith we believe the Scripture.

That it is unreaſonable to think, that he that reads the Scripture, and uſes all means appointed for this purpoſe, with an earneſt deſire and with no other end, but to find the will of God and obey it, if he miſtake the meaning of ſome doubtful places, and fall unwillingly into ſome errors, unto which no vice or paſſion betrays him, and is willing to hear reaſon from any man that will undertake to ſhew him his error: I ſay, that it is unreaſonable to think, that a God of goodneſs will impute ſuch an error to ſuch a man.

Againſt

Againſt the ſecond it was demonſtrated unto me, that the place I built on ſo confidently, was no Argument at all for the Infallibility of the Succeſſion of Paſtors in the *Roman* Church, but a very ſtrong Argument againſt it.

Firſt, no Argument for it; becauſe it is not certain, nor can ever be proved, that S. *Paul* ſpeaks there of any ſucceſſion; *Epheſ.* 4. 11, 12, 13. For let that be granted which is deſired, that in the 13. ver. by [*until we all meet*] is meant, until all the Children of God meet in the Unity of Faith; that is, unto the Worlds end: yet it is not ſaid there, *that he gave Apoſtles and Prophets*, &c. *which ſhould continue*, &c. *until we all meet*, by connecting the 13. *ver.* to the 11. But he gave (then upon his Aſcenſion and miraculouſly endowed) Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* for the work of the miniſtry, for the Conſummation of the Saints, for the Edification of the Body of Chriſt, until we all meet, that is, if you will, unto the Worlds end. Neither is there any incongruity, but that the Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* which lived then, may in good ſenſe be ſaid, now at this time and ever hereafter to do thoſe things which they are ſaid to do: For who can deny but S. *Paul* the Apoſtle and Doctor of the Gentiles, and S. *John* the Evangeliſt and Prophet, do at this very time (by their writings, though not by their perſons) do the work of the miniſtry, conſummate the Saints, and Edifie the Body of Chriſt.

Secondly, it cannot be ſhewn or proved from hence, that there is or was to be any ſuch ſucceſſion: becauſe S. *Paul* here tells us only, that he gave ſuch in the time paſt, not that he promiſed ſuch in the time to come.

Thirdly, it is evident, that God promiſed no ſuch ſucceſſion, becauſe it is not certain that he hath made good any ſuch promiſe; for who is ſo impudent as to pretend, that there are now, and have been in all Ages ſince Chriſt, ſome Apoſtles and ſome Prophets and ſome Evangeliſts and ſome Paſtors and Teachers: Eſpecially ſuch as he here ſpeaks of, that is, endowed with ſuch gifts as Chriſt gave upon his Aſcenſion; of which he ſpeaks in the 8 *ver.* ſaying; *He led Captivity Captive, and gave gifts*

unto men. And that thoſe gifts were —— Men endowed with extraordinary Power and Supernatural gifts —— it is apparent, becauſe theſe Words, *and he gave ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets*, &c. are added by way of explication and illuſtration of that which was ſaid before —— *and he gave gifts unto Men*: And if any man except hereunto, that though the Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts were extraordinary and for the Plantation of the Goſpel, yet Paſtors were ordinary and for continuance: I anſwer, it is true, ſome Paſtors are ordinary and for continuance, but not ſuch as are here ſpoken of: not ſuch as are endowed with the ſtrange and heavenly gifts, which Chriſt gave not only to the Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts, but to the inferior Paſtors and Doctors of his Church, at the firſt Plantation of it: And therefore S. *Paul* in the 1ſt. to the *Corinth.* 12. 28. (to which place we are referred by the Margent of the Vulgar Tranſlation, for the explication of this,) places this gift of teaching amongſt, and prefers it before many other miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghoſt: Paſtors there are ſtill in the Church, but not ſuch as *Titus* and *Timothy* and *Apollos* and *Barnabas*: not ſuch as can juſtly pretend to immediate inſpiration and illumination of the Holy Ghoſt: And therefore ſeeing there neither are nor have been for many Ages in the Church, ſuch Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* as here are ſpoken of, it is certain he promiſed none; or otherwiſe we muſt blaſphemouſly charge him with breach of his promiſe.

Secondly, I anſwer, that if by *dedit he gave*, be meant *promiſit*, he *promiſed* for ever; then all were promiſed and all ſhould have continued. If by *dedit* be not meant *promiſit*, then he promiſed none ſuch, nor may we expect any ſuch by vertue of, or warrant from this Text that is here alledged: And thus much for the firſt Aſſumpt which was, that the place was no Argument for an infallible ſucceſſion in the Church of *Rome.*

Now for the ſecond, That it is a ſtrong Argument againſt it, thus I make it good.

The Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts and Paſtors, which our Saviour gave upon his Aſcenſion, were given by

by him that they might Conſummate the Saints, do the work of the Miniſtry, Edifie the Body of Chriſt, until we all come into the Unity of Faith, that we be not like Children wavering and carried up and down with every wind of Doctrine. The Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* that then were, do not now in their own perſons and by oral inſtruction do the work of the Miniſtry, to the intent we may be kept from wavering and being carried up and down with every wind of Doctrine: therefore they do this ſome other way: Now there is no other way by which they can do it, but by their writings; and therefore by their writings they do it: therefore by their writings and believing of them we are to be kept from wavering in matters of Faith: therefore the Scriptures of the Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts are our Guides. Therefore not the Church of *Rome.*

FINIS.

AN ANSWER To Some PASSAGES IN *Rushworths* Dialogues.

BEGINNING

At the Third Dialogue Section 12. p. 181. Ed. *Paris*, 1654.

ABOUT

TRADITIONS.

LONDON,

Printed for *James Adamson*, at the *Angel* in S. *Pauls* Church-Yard, 1687.

AN ANSWER

To ſome paſſages in

Ruſhworths Dialogues.

BEGINNING AT
The Third Dialogue, §. 12. *p.* 181. Ed. *Paris*, 1654.

ABOUT TRADITIONS.

Uncle. DO you think there is ſuch a City as *Rome* or *Conſtantinople?*

Nephew. That I do, I would I knew what I ask as well.

CHILLINGWORTH.

Firſt I ſhould have anſwered that in propriety of Speech I could not ſay that I *knew* it, but that I did as undoubtedly *believe* it, as thoſe things which I did know. For though (as I conceive) we may be properly ſaid to believe that which we know, yet we cannot ſay truly, that we know that which we only believe upon report and hearſay, be it never ſo conſtant, never ſo general: For ſeeing the generality of men is made up of particulars, and every particular man may deceive and be deceived, it is not impoſſible, though exceedingly improbable, that all men ſhould conſpire

conſpire to do ſo. Yet I deny not that the popular phraſe of Speech will very well bear, that we may ſay we *know* that which in truth we only *believe*, provided the grounds of our belief be morally certain.

Neither do I take any exception to the Nephews anſwers, made to his Uncles 2, 3, 4. and 5. Interrogatories. But grant willingly as to the firſt, that it is not much material whether I remember or not any particular Author of ſuch a general and conſtant report. Then, that the Teſtimony of one or two Witneſſes, though never ſo credible, could add nothing to that belief which is already at the height, nay perhaps that my own ſeeing theſe Cities would make no acceſſion, add no degree to the ſtrength and firmneſs of my Faith concerning this matter, only it would change the kind of my aſſent, and make me *know* that which formerly I did but *believe*.

To the fourth, that ſeeming Reaſons are not much to be regarded againſt ſenſe or experience and moral Certainties (but withal I ſhould have told my Uncle, that I fear his ſuppoſition is hardly poſſible, and that the nature of the thing will not admit, that there ſhould be any great, nay any probable reaſons invented to perſwade me that there never was ſuch a City as *London*) and therefore if any man ſhould go about to perſwade me that there never was ſuch a City as *London*; That there were no ſuch men as called themſelves, or were called by others Proteſtants, in *England*, in the days of Q. *Elizabeth*, perhaps ſuch a mans Wit might delight me, but his reaſons ſure would never perſwade me.

Hitherto we ſhould have gone hand in hand together, but whereas in the next place he ſays — *In like manner then you do not doubt, but a Catholick living in a Catholick Country, may undoubtedly know what was the publick Religion of his Country in his Fathers days, and that ſo aſſuredly that it were a meer madneſs for him to doubt thereof.* — I ſhould have craved leave to tell my Uncle that he preſumed too far upon his Nephews yielding diſpoſition. For that as it is a far more eaſie thing to know, and more authentically teſtified, that there were ſome men called Proteteſtants

ſtants by themſelves and others, than what opinions theſe Proteſtants held, divers men holding divers things, which yet were all called by this name. So is it far more eaſie for a *Roman Catholick* to know that in his Fathers days there were ſome men, for their outward Communion with and ſubordination to the Biſhop of *Rome* called *Roman Catholicks*, than to know what was the Religion of thoſe men who went under this name, For they might be as different one from another in their belief, as ſome Proteſtants are from others.

As for example, had I lived before the *Lateran* Council which condemned *Berengarius*, poſſibly I might have known that the belief of the *Real preſence* of Chriſt in the Sacrament was part of the publick Doctrine of my Country: But whether the Real abſence of the Bread and Wine after Conſecration, and their Tranſubſtantiation into Chriſts Body, were likewiſe *Catholick* Doctrine at that time, *that*, I could not have known, ſeeing that all men were at liberty to hold it was ſo, or it was not ſo.

Moreover I ſhould have told my Uncle, that living now, I know it is *Catholick* Doctrine, That the Souls of the Bleſſed enjoy the Viſion of God: But if I had lived in the Reign of *Pope John* the XXII, I ſhould not have known that then it was ſo, conſidering that many good Catholicks before that time had believed, and then, even the *Pope* himſelf did believe the contrary: and he is warranted by *Bellarmine* for doing ſo, becauſe the Church had not then defined it.

I ſhould have told him further that either Catholicks of the preſent time do ſo differ in their belief, that what ſome hold lawful and pious, others condemn as unlawful and impious: or elſe that all now conſent, and conſequently make it *Catholick* Doctrine, That it is not unlawful to make the uſual Pictures of the *Trinity*, and to ſet them in Churches to be adored. But had I lived in S. *Auſtins* time, I ſhould then have been taught another Leſſon: To wit, that this Doctrine and practice was impious, and the contrary Doctrine Catholick.

I should have told him that now I was taught that the Doctrine of Indulgences was an Apostolick Tradition: but had I lived 600 years since, and found that in all antiquity there was no use of them: I should either have thought the Primitive Church no faithful Steward in defrauding mens Souls of this Treasure intended by God to them, and so necessary for them, or rather that the Doctrine of Indulgences now practised in the Church of *Rome* was not then Catholick.

I should have told him that the general practice of *Roman* Catholicks now taught me that it was a pious thing to offer Incense and Tapers to the Saints and to their Pictures: But had I lived in the Primitive Church, I should with the Church have condemned it in the *Collyridians* as Heretical.

I should have represented to him *Erasmus* his complaint against the Protestants, whose departing from the *Roman* Church occasioned the determining, and exacting the belief of many points as necessary, wherein before *Luther* men enjoyed the Liberties of their Judgments and Tongues and Pens. *Antea*, saies he, *licebat varias agitare quæstiones, de potestate Pontificis, de Condonationibus, de restituendo, de Purgatorio: nunc tutum non est hiscere, ne de his quidèm, quæ piè verèque dicuntur. Et credere cogimur, quod homo gignit ex se opera meritoria, quod benefactis meretur vitam æternam, etiam de condigno, Quòd B. Virgo potest imperare Filio cum Patre regnanti ut exaudiat hujus aut illius preces, aliaque permulta ad quæ piæ mentes inhorrescunt.* And from hence I should have collected, as I think very probably, that it was not then such a known and certain thing, what was the Catholick Faith in many points which now are determined, but that divers men who held external Communion with that Church which now holds these as matters of Faith, conceived themselves no waies bound to do so, but at liberty to hold as they saw reason.

I should have shewed him by the confession of another Learned Catholick, That through the negligence of the Bishops in former Ages, and the indiscreet Devotion of the People many opinions and practices were brought into the Church, which at first perhaps were but wink'd at,

after

after tolerated, then approved, and at length after they had ſpread themſelves into a ſeeming Generality, confirmed for good and Catholick: and that therefore there was no certainty, that they came from the beginning whoſe beginning was not known.

I ſhould have remembred him that even by the acknowledgment of the Council of *Trent*, many corruptions and ſuperſtitions had by inſenſible degrees inſinuated themſelves into the very Maſs and Offices of the Church, which they thought fit to caſt out: and therefore ſeeing that ſome abuſes have come in, God knows how, and have been caſt out again, who can aſcertain me that ſome Errors have not got in, and while men ſlept (for it is apparent they did ſleep) gathered ſuch ſtrength, gotten ſuch deep root, and ſo incorporated themſelves, like Ivy in a Wall, in the State and polity of the *Roman* Church, that to pull them up had been to pull them down, by raſing the Foundation on which it ſtands, to wit, the Churches Infallibility? Beſides as much water paſſes under the Mill which the Miller ſees not, ſo who can warrant me that ſome old corruptions, might not eſcape from them, and paſs for Original and Apoſtolick Traditions? I ſay *might not*; though they had been as ſtudious to reduce all to the primitive State, as they were to preſerve them in the preſent State, as diligent to caſt out all Poſtnate and introduct opinions, as they were to perſuade men that there were none ſuch, but all as truly Catholick and Apoſtolick as they were *Roman.*

I ſhould have declared unto him that many things reckoned up in the Roll of Traditions are now grown out of faſhion and out of uſe in the Church of *Rome*: and therefore that either they believed them not, whatever they pretended, or were not ſo obedient to the Apoſtles command as they themſelves interpret it —— *Keep the Traditions which ye have received, whether by word or by our Epiſtle.*

And ſeeing there have been ſo many viciſſitudes and changes in the *Roman* Church: Catholick Doctrines growing exolete, and being degraded from their Catholiciſm, and perhaps depreſt into the number of Hereſies: Points

of Indifference, or at least *Aliens* from the Faith, getting first to be Inmates, after, procuring to be made *Denizons*, and in process of time necessary members of the Body of the Faith: Nay Old Heresies sometimes like old Snakes, casting their Skin and their Poyson together, and becoming wholsom and Catholick Doctrines. I must have desired pardon of my Uncle, if I were not so undoubtedly certain what was and what was not Catholick Doctrine in the days of my Fathers.

Nay perhaps I should have gone further and told him, That I was not fully assured what was the Catholick Doctrine in some points, no not at this present time. For instance, to lay the Axe unto the Root of the Tree: the infallibility of the present Church of *Rome*, in determining controversies of Faith, is esteemed indeed by divers that I have met with, not only an Article of Faith, but a Foundation of all other Articles. But how do I know there are not, nay why should I think there are not in the World divers good Catholicks of the same mind touching this matter, which *Mirandula*, *Panormitan*, *Cusanus*, *Florentinus*, *Clemangis*, *Waldensis*, *Occham*, and divers others were of, who were so far from holding this Doctrine the Foundation of Faith, that they would not allow it any place in the Fabrick.

Now *Bellarmine* has taught us that no Doctrine is Catholick, nor the contrary Heretical, that is denied to be so by some good Catholicks. From hence I collect that in the time of the forenamed Authors, this was not Catholick Doctrine, nor the contrary Heretical; and being then not so, how it could since become so, I cannot well understand: If it be said that it has since been defined by a General Council; I say first, This is false, no Council has been so fooliſh as to define that a Council is Infallible, for unless it were presumed to be Infallible before, who or what could assure us of the Truth of this definition? Secondly if it were true it were ridiculous: for he that would question the Infallibility of all Councils in all their Decrees, would as well question the Infallibility of this Council in this Decree. This therefore was not, is not,

nor

nor ever can be an Article of Faith, unless God himself would be pleased (which is not very likely) to make some new Revelation of it from Heaven.

The πρῶτον ψεῦδος, the Fountain of the Error in this matter is this: That the whole Religion of the *Roman Church* and every point of it, is conceived or pretended to have issued Originally out of the Fountain of Apostolick Tradition, either in themselves or in the principles from which they are evidently deducible. Whereas it is evident that many of their Doctrines, may be Originally derived from the Decrees of Councils, many from Papal definitions, many from the Authority of some great Man; To which purpose it is very remarkable what *Gregory Nazianzen* says of *Athanasius*. * *What pleased him was a law to men, what did not please him was as a thing prohibited by Law; his Decrees were to them like* Moses *his Tables, and he had a greater veneration paid him than seems to be due from men to Saints.*

* Τῦτο λῶ νόμ@ αὐτοῖς ὅ τι ἐκείνῳ ἐδόκει, καὶ τῦτο ἀπώμοτον πάλιν, ὃ μὴ ἐδόκει, κὴ πλάκας Μωϋσέως αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐκείνε δόγματα, καὶ πλεῖον τὸ σέβας ἢ παρὰ ἀνθρώπων τοῖς ἁγίοις ὀφειλόμενον. Orat XXI. *in* Laudem Athanasii.

And as memorable that in the late great Controversie about Predetermination and Free-will, disputed before *Pope Clement* VII. by the Jesuits and Dominicans, The *Popes* resolution was, if he had determined the matter, to define for that opinion which was most agreeable, not to Scripture, nor to Apostolick Tradition, nor to a consent of Fathers, but to the Doctrine of S. *Austin*: so that if the *Pope* had made an Article of Faith of this Controversie, it is evident S. *Austin* had been the Rule of it.

Sometimes upon erroneous grounds Customs have been brought in, God knows how, and after have spread themselves through the whole Church. Thus *Gordonius Huntleius* confesses, that because Baptism and the Eucharist had been anciently given both together to men of ripe years, when they were converted to Christianity; Afterwards by Error when Infants were Baptized, they gave the Eucharist also to Infants. This Custom in short time grew Universal, and in S. *Austins* time passed currantly for an Apostolick Tradition, and the Eucharist was thought as necessary for them as Baptism. This Custom the Church of *Rome* hath again cast out, and in so doing profest either

ther her no regard to the traditions of the Apostles, or that this was none of that number. But yet she cannot possibly avoid but that this example is a proof sufficient that many things may get in by Error into the Church, and by degrees obtain the esteem and place of Apostolick Traditions which yet are not so.

The Custom of denying the Laity the Sacramental Cup, and the Doctrine that it is lawful to do so, who can pretend to derive from Apostolick Tradition? Especially when the * Council of Constance the Patron of it, confesses that Christs institution was under both kinds, and that the faithful in the Primitive Church received it in both. —— *Licet Christus*, &c. *Although Christ after his Supper instituted and administred this venerable Sacrament under both kinds.* —— *Although in the Primitive Church this Sacrament were received by the faithful under both kinds.* —— Non obstante, *&c.* —— *Yet all this notwithstanding this Custom for the avoiding of Scandals* (to which the Primitive Church was as obnoxious as the present is) *was upon just reason brought in, that Laicks should receive only under one kind.*

* *Sess.* XIII.

Brought in therefore it was, and so is one of those Doctrines which *Lerinensis* calls — *inducta non tradita, inventa non accepta*, &c. therefore all the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church does not descend from Apostolick Tradition.

But if this Custom came not from the Apostles, from what Original may we think that it descended? Certaintainly from no other than from the belief of the substantial presence of whole Christ under either kind. For this opinion being once setled in the Peoples minds, that they had as much by one kind as by both; both Priest and People quickly began to think it superfluous, to do the same thing twice at the same time; and thereupon, being (as I suppose) the Custom required that the Bread should be received first, having received that, they were contented that the Priest should save the pains, and the Parish the charge of unnecessary reiteration. This is my Conjecture which I submit to better judgments; but whether it be true or false, one thing from hence is certain,

That

That immemorial Customs may by degrees prevail upon the Church, such as have no known beginning nor Author, of which yet this may be evidently known, that their beginning whensoever it was, was many years, nay, many Ages after the Apostles.

* S. *Paul* commands that nothing be done in the Church but for edification. He says, and if that be not enough, he proves in the same place, that it is not for edification that either Publick Prayers, Thanksgiving and Hymns to God, or Doctrine to the People should be in any Language which the Assistants generally understand not; and thereupon forbids any such practice though it were in a Language miraculously infused into the speaker by the Holy Ghost: unless he himself or some other present could and would interpret. He tells us that to do otherwise is to speak into the Air: That it is to play the *Barbarians* to one another: That to such Blessings and Thanksgivings, the ignorant for want of understanding cannot say *Amen*. He clearly intimates that to think otherwise is to be Children in understanding. Lastly, in the end of the Chapter he tells all that were Prophets and Spiritual among the *Corinthians*, That the things written by him are the Commandments of God. Hereupon *Lyranus* upon the place acknowledgeth that in the Primitive Church, Blessings and all other Services were done in the Vulgar Tongue. Cardinal *Cajetan* likewise upon the place tells us that out of this Doctrine of S. *Paul* it is consequent, That it were better for the Edification of the Church, that the publick Prayers which are said in the Peoples hearing, should be delivered in a Language common both to the Clergy and the People. And I am confident that the Learnedst Antiquary in the *Roman* Church cannot, nay that *Baronius* himself, were he alive again, could not produce so much as one example of any one Church, one City, one Parish in all the Christian World, for five hundred years after Christ, where the Sermons to the People were in one Language, and the Service in another. Now it is confest on all hands to be against sense and reason, that Sermons should be made to the People in any

1 *Cor.* 14. 26. 27, 28. 9. 11. 16. 20. 37.

any Language not understood by them, and therefore it follows of necessity, that their Service likewise was in those Tongues which the People of the place understood.

But what talk we of 500. years after Christ? when even the *Lateran* Council held in the year 1215. makes this Decree. *Quoniam in plerisque—— Because in many parts within the same City and Diocess, People are mixed of divers Languages, having under one Faith divers rites and fashions, we strictly command that the Bishops of the said Cities or Dioceses provide fit and able men, who according to the diversities of their Rites and Languages may celebrate Divine Services and administer the Sacraments of the Church, instructing them both in word and example.*

Now after all this if any man will still maintain, that the Divine Service in unknown Tongues is a matter of Apostolick Tradition, I must needs think the World is grown very impudent.

There are divers Doctrines in the *Roman* Church which have not yet arrived to the honour to be *Donatæ civitate*, to be received into the number of Articles of Faith; which yet press very hard for it, and through the importunity and multitude of their Attorneys that plead for them, in process of time may very probably be admitted. Of this rank are the Blessed Virgins Immaculate conception, The *Popes* Infallibility in determining Controversies, His superiority to Councils, His indirect Power over Princes in Temporalties, *&c.* Now as these are not yet matters of Faith and Apostolick Traditions, yet in after Ages in the days of our great Grandchildren may very probably become so, so why should we not fear and suspect, that many things now pass currantly as points of Faith which *Ecclesia ab Apostolis, Apostoli à Christo, Christus à Deo recepit*, which perhaps in the days of our great Grandfathers had no such reputation.

Cardinal *Perron* teaches us two Rules whereby to know the Doctrine of the Church in any Age. The first is when the most eminent Fathers of any Age agree in the affirmation of any Doctrine, and none of their Contemporaries oppose or condemn them, that is to be accounted the

the Doctrine of the Church. The ſecond: when one or more of theſe Eminent Fathers, ſpeak of any Doctrine not as Doctors but as witneſſes, and ſay, not, *I think ſo, or hold ſo,* but, *the Church holds and believes this to be Truth.* This is to be accounted the Doctrine of the Church. Now if neither of theſe Rules be good and certain, then are we deſtitute of all means to know what was the publick Doctrine of the Church in the days of our Fathers. But on the other ſide, if either of them be true, we run into a worſe inconvenience; for then ſurely the Doctrine of the Millinaries muſt be acknowledged to have been the Doctrine of the Church in the very next Age after the Apoſtles. For both the moſt eminent Fathers of that time, and even all whoſe Monuments are extant, or mention made of them, *viz. Juſtin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Melito Sardenſis,* agree in the affirmation of this point, and none of their contemporary writers oppoſe or condemn it: And beſides they ſpeak not as Doctors but as Witneſſes, not as of their own private opinion, but as Apoſtolick Tradition and the Doctrine of the Church.

Horantius and out of him *Franciſcus a Sancta Clara* teach us that under the Goſpel there is no where extant any precept of Invocating Saints, and tell us that the Apoſtles reaſon of their giving no ſuch precept was, leſt the converted Gentiles might think themſelves drawn over from one kind of Idolatry to another. If this reaſon be good, I hope then the poſition whereof it is the reaſon is true, *viz.* that the Apoſtles did neither command nor teach, nor adviſe, nor perſuade the converted Gentiles to invocate Saints, for the reaſon here rendred ſerves for all alike, and if they did not, and for this reaſon did not ſo: how then in Gods name comes invocation of Saints to be an Apoſtolick Tradition?

The Doctrines of Purgatory, Indulgences, and Prayer to deliver Souls out of Purgatory are ſo cloſely conjoyned, that they muſt either ſtand or fall together; at leaſt, the firſt being the Foundation of the other two, if that be not Apoſtolick Tradition, the reſt cannot be ſo. And if that be ſo, what meant the Author of the Book of Wiſ-

dom to tell us that (after Death) *the Souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there ſhall no torment touch them.* What means S. *John* to teach us, That they are *Bleſſed which Die in the Lord, for that they reſt from their Labours.* But above all what meant Biſhop *Fiſher* in his Confutation of *Luthers* aſſertion ſo to prevaricate as to me he ſeems to do in the 18th. Art. in ſaying, *multos fortaſſe movet,* &c. *Peradventure many are moved not to place too great Faith in Indulgences, becauſe the uſe of them may ſeem not of long ſtanding in the Church, and a very late invention among Chriſtians. To whom I anſwer that* * *it is not certain by whom they began firſt to be taught. Yet ſome uſe there was of them, as they ſay very Ancient among the* Romans, *which we are given to underſtand by the Stations which were ſo frequented in that City. Moreover they ſay* Gregory *the firſt granted ſome in his time.* And after *Cæterum ut dicere cæpimus,* &c. —— *But as we were ſaying, there are many things of which in the Primitive Church no mention was made, which yet upon doubts ariſing are become perſpicuous through the diligence of after times. Certainly, (to return to our buſineſs) no* Orthodox *man now doubts whether there be a Purgatory, of which yet among the Ancients there was made very rare or no mention. Moreover the* Greeks *to this very day believe not Purgatory. Who ſo will let him read the writings of the Ancient* Greeks, *and I think he ſhall find no ſpeech of Purgatory, or elſe very rarely. The Latines alſo received not this verity all at once but by little and little. Neither was the Faith whether of Purgatory or Indulgences ſo neceſſary in the Primitive Church as now it is, for then Charity was ſo fervent that every one was moſt ready to Die for Chriſt. Crimes were very rare, and thoſe which were, were puniſhed by the* Canons *with great ſeverity. But now a great part of the People would rather put off Chriſtianity than ſuffer the rigour of the* Canons. *That not without the great Wiſdom of the Holy Spirit, it hath come to paſs that after the courſe of ſo many years, the Faith of Purgatory and the uſe of Indulgences hath been by the* Orthodox *generally received as long as there was no care of Purgatory, no man look'd after Indulgences, for all the Credit of Indulgences depends on that. Take away*

* *Therefore it is not true that all the* Roman *Doctrines were taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.*

away Purgatory and what need is there of Indulgences. We therefore conſidering that Purgatory was a long while unknown. That after, partly upon Revelations partly upon Scripture it was believed by ſome, and that ſo at length the Faith of it was moſt generally received by the Orthodox Church, ſhall eaſily find out ſome reaſon of Indulgences. Seeing therefore it was ſo late ere Purgatory was known and received by the Univerſal Church, who now can wonder touching Indulgences, that in the Primitive Church there was no uſe of them? Indulgences therefore began after men had trembled a while at the Torments of Purgatory. For then it is credible the Holy Fathers began to think more carefully by what means they might provide for their Flocks a remedy againſt thoſe Torments, for them eſpecially who had not time enough to fulfil the Penance which the Canons *enjoyned.*

Eraſmus tell us of himſelf, that though he did certainly know and could prove, that *Auricular Confeſſion* ſuch as is in uſe in the *Roman* Church, were not of Divine inſtitution: yet he would not ſay ſo, becauſe he conceived Confeſſion a great reſtraint from ſin, and very profitable for the times he lived in, and therefore thought it expedient, that men ſhould rather by Error hold that neceſſary and commanded, which was only profitable and adviſed, than by believing, though truly the non-neceſſity of it to neglect the uſe of that, as by experience we ſee moſt men do which was ſo beneficial: If he thought ſo of Confeſſion, and yet thought it not fit to ſpeak his mind, why might he not think the like of other points, and yet out of diſcretion and Charity hold his peace? And why might not others of his time do ſo as well as he: and if ſo, how ſhall I be aſſured that in the Ages before him there were not other men alike minded, who though they knew and ſaw Errors and Corruptions in the Church, yet conceiving more danger in the remedy, than harm in the diſeaſe, were contented *hoc Catone* —— to let things alone as they were, leſt by attempting to pluck the Ivy out of the Wall, they might pull down the Wall it ſelf, with which the Ivy was ſo incorporated.

Sir *Edwin Sandys* relates that in his Travels he met

with divers men, who, though they believed the Pope to be Antichrist, and his Church Antichristian, yet thought themselves not bound to separate from the Communion of it: nay thought themselves bound not to do so: because the True Church was to be the Seat of Antichrist, from the Communion whereof no man might divide himself upon any pretence whatsoever.

And much to this purpose is that which *Charron* tells us in his third *Verité*, *cap.* 4. §. 13. 15. That although all that which the Protestants say falsly of the Church of *Rome*, were true, yet for all this they must not depart from it: and again, Though the Pope were Antichrist, and the Estate of the Church, were such (that is as corrupt both in discipline and Doctrine) as they (Protestants) pretend, yet they must not go out of it. Both these assertions he proves at large in the above-cited Paragraphs, with very many and very plausible reasons: which I believe would prove his intent, had not the corruptions of the *Roman* Church possessed and infected even the publick Service of God among them, in which their Communion was required: and did not the Church of *Rome* require the *Belief* of all her Errors, as the condition of her Communion. But howsoever be his reasons conclusive or not conclusive certainly this was the profest opinion of him, and divers others; as by name *Cassander* and *Baldwin*, who though they thought as ill of the Doctrine of the most prevailing part of the Church of *Rome*; as Protestants do, yet thought it their duty not to separate from her Communion. And if there were any considerable number of considerable men thus minded (as I know not why any man should think there was not) then it is made not only a most difficult, but even an impossible thing to know what was the *Catholick* Judgment of our Fathers in the points of controversie: seeing they might be joyned in Communion, and yet very far divided in opinion. They might all live in obedience to the Pope, and yet some think him head of the Church by Divine right: others (as a great part of the *French Church* at this day) by Ecclesiastical constitution: others by neither, but by

by Practice and Uſurpation, wherein yet becauſe he had Preſcription of many Ages for him he might not juſtly be diſturbed.

All might go to Confeſſion and yet ſome only think it neceſſary; others only profitable. All might go to Maſs and the other Services of the Church, and ſome only like and approve the Language of it: others only tolerate it and wiſh it altered if it might be, without greater inconvenience. All might receive the Sacrament, and yet ſome believe it to be the Body and Blood of Chriſt, others only a Sacrament of it. Some that the Maſs was a true and proper Sacrifice, others only a Commemorative Sacrifice, or the Commemoration of a Sacrifice. Some that it was lawful for the Clergy to deny the Laiety the Sacramental Cup: others that it was lawful for them to receive in one kind only, ſeeing they could not in both. Some might adore Chriſt as preſent there according to his Humanity, others as preſent according to his Divine Nature only. Some might pray for the Dead as believing them in Purgatory: others upon no certain ground, but only that they ſhould rather have their Prayers and Charity which wanted them not, than that they which did want them ſhould not have them. Some might pray to Saints upon a belief that they heard their Prayers and knew their Hearts; others might pray to them meaning nothing but to pray by them, that God for their ſakes would grant their Prayers: others thirdly, might not pray to them at all, as thinking it unneceſſary, others as fearing it unlawful, yet becauſe they were not fully reſolved, only forbearing it themſelves, and not condemning it in others.

Uncle. I pray you then remember alſo what it is that Proteſtants do commonly taunt and check Catholicks with, is it not that they believe Traditions?

It is a meer Calumny that Proteſtants condemn all kind of Traditions, who ſubſcribe very willingly to that of *Vincentius Lerinenſis.* That Chriſtian Religion is —— *res tradita non inventa,* a matter of Tradition not of mans invention, is, what the Church received from the Apoſtles, (and by conſequence what the Apoſtles delivered to the Church)

Church) and the Apoſtles from Chriſt, and Chriſt from God. *Chemnitius* in his Examen of the Council of *Trent* hath liberally granted ſeven ſorts of Traditions, and Proteſtants find no fault with him for it. Prove therefore any Tradition to be Apoſtolick, which is not written. Shew that there is ſome known Word of God which we are commanded to believe, that is not contained in the Books of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, and we ſhall quickly ſhew that we believe Gods Word becauſe it is Gods, and not becauſe it is written. If there were any thing not written which had come down to us with as full and Univerſal a Tradition as the unqueſtioned Books of Canonical Scripture, That thing ſhould I believe as well as the Scripture: but I have long ſought for ſome ſuch thing, and yet I am to ſeek: Nay I am confident no one point in Controverſie between Papiſts and Proteſtants can go in upon half ſo fair Cards, for to gain the eſteem of an Apoſtolick Tradition, as thoſe things which are now decried on all hands, I mean the opinion of the *Chiliaſts*; and *the Communicating Infants*. The latter by the confeſſion of Cardinal *Perron*, *Maldonate*, and *Binius* was the Cuſtom of the Church for 600 years at leaſt: It is expreſly and in terms vouched by S. *Auſtin* for the Doctrine of the Church and an Apoſtolick Tradition: it was never inſtituted by General Council, but in the uſe of the Church, as long before the Firſt general Council as S. *Cyprian* before the Council. There is no known Author of the beginning of it: all which are the Catholick marks of an Apoſtolick Tradition, and yet this you ſay is not ſo, or if it be, why have you aboliſht it? The former Lineally derives its pedigree from our Saviour to St. *John*: from S. *John* to *Papias*: from *Papias* to *Juſtin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Melito Sardenſis*, *Tertullian* and others of the two firſt Ages: who as they generally agree in the Affirmation of this Doctrine, and are not contradicted by any of their Predeceſſors: ſo ſome of them at leaſt, ſpeak to the point not as Doctors but Witneſſes, and deliver it for the Doctrine of the Church and Apoſtolick Tradition, and condemn the contrary as Hereſie. And therefore if there

there be any unwritten Traditions, these certainly must be admitted first: or if these which have so fair pretence to it must yet be rejected: I hope then we shall have the like liberty to put back Purgatory, and Indulgences, and Transubstantiation, and the Latin Service, and the Communion in one kind, *&c.* none of which is of Age enough to be Page to either of the forenamed Doctrines, especially the opinion of the Millenaries.

Uncle. What think you means this word Tradition? No other thing certainly but that we confute all our Adversaries by the Testimony of the former Church; saying unto them, this was the belief of our Fathers; Thus were we taught by them and they by theirs, without stop or stay till you come to Christ.

We confute our Adversaries by saying thus——Truly a very easie confutation: But saying and proving are two Mens Offices; and therefore though you be excellent in the former, I fear when it comes to the Tryal, you will be found defective in the Latter.

Uncle. And this no other but the *Roman* Church did or could ever pretend to, which being in truth undeniable, and they cannot choose but grant the thing; Their last refuge is to laugh, and say that both Fathers and Councils did Err because they were men, as if Protestants themselves were more. Is it not so as I tell you?

No indeed, it is not by your leave, good *Uncle.* For first the *Greek* Church as every body knows, pretends to perpetual succession of Doctrine, and undertakes to derive it from Christ and his Apostles, as confidently as we do ours: Neither is there any word in all this discourse, but might have been urged as fairly and as probably for the *Greek* Church as for the *Roman*: and therefore seeing your Arguments fight for both alike, they must either conclude for both, which is a direct impossibility, for then Contradictions should be both true: or else which is most certain they conclude for neither and are not Demonstrations as you pretend, (for never any Demonstration could prove both parts of a Contradiction) but meer Sophisms

phisms and Captions, as the progress of our answer shall justifie.

Secondly, It is so far from Protestants to grant the thing you speak of, To wit, that the controverted Doctrines of the *Roman* Church came from Apostolick Tradition, that they verily believe should the Apostles now live again, they would hardly be able to find amongst you the Doctrin which they taught by reason of abundance of trash and rubbish which you have laid upon it.

And lastly, They pretend not that Fathers and Councils may err and they cannot, nor that they were men and themselves are not; but that you do most unjustly and vainly to father your inventions of Yesterday upon the Fathers and Councils.

Nephew. I know that we Catholicks do reverence Traditions as much as Scripture it self: neither do I see why we should be blamed for it; for the words which Christ and his Apostles spake, must needs be as infallible as those which were written.

True. But still the question depends, whether Christ and his Apostles did indeed speak those words which you pretend they did: we say with *Irenæus: Præconiaverunt primum, scripserunt postea.* What they preacht first, that they wrote afterwards: we say with *Tertullian—(Ecclesias) Apostoli condiderunt, ipsi eis prædicando, tam vivâ quod aiunt voce, quam per Epistolas postea.*—The Apostles founded the Churches by their Preaching to them: first by word of mouth, then after by their writings. If you can prove the contrary do so and we yield: but hitherto you do nothing.

Nephew. And as for the keeping of it, I see the Scripture it self is beholden to Tradition (Gods providence presupposed) for the integrity both of the letter, and the sense. Of the letter it is confest: of the sense manifest. For the sense being a distinct thing from the naked letter, and rather fetcht out by force of consequence, than in expres and formal terms contained, (which is most true whether we speak of *Protestant* sense or the *Catholick*) it belongeth rather to Tradition than expres Text of Scripture.

That

That which you desire to conclude is, That we must be beholden to Tradition for the sense of Scripture: and your reason to conclude this is, because the sense is fetcht out by force of consequence: This of some places of Scripture is not true, especially those which belong to faith and good manners, which carry their meaning in their foreheads. Of others it is true, but nothing to the purpose in hand, but rather directly against it. For who will not say, If I collect the sense of Scripture by Reason, then I have it not from Authority: that is unless I am mistaken. If I fetch it out by force of Consequence, then I am not beholden to Tradition for it. But the letter of Scripture has been preserved by Tradition, and therefore why should we not receive other things upon Tradition as well as Scripture? I answer. The Jews Tradition preserved the books of the Old Testament, and why then doth our Saviour receive these upon their Tradition, and yet condemn other things which they suggested as matters of Tradition? If you say it was because these Traditions came not from *Moses* as they were pretended; I say also that yours are only pretended and not proved to come from the Apostles. Prove your Tradition of these Additions as well as you prove the Tradition of Scripture, and assure your selves, we then according to the injunction of the Council of *Trent* shall receive both with equal reverence.

Nephew. As it may appear by the sense of these few words. *Hoc est corpus meum,* whether you take the *Protestant* or the *Catholick* sense: For the same Text cannot have two contrary senses of it self, but as they are fetcht out by force of Argument; and therefore what sense hath best Tradition to shew for it self that's the Truth.

This is neither Protestant nor Catholick sense, but if we may speak the truth direct nonsense. For what if the same Text cannot have contrary senses: is there therefore no means but Tradition to determin which is the true sense? What connexion or what relation is there between this Antecedent and this Consequent? certainly they are

meer strangers to one another, and until they met by chance in this argument, never saw each other before. He that can find a third proposition to joyn them together in a good syllogism, I profess unto you, —*Erit mihi magnus Appollo.* —But what if of these two contrary senses the one, that is the Literal, draw after it a long train of absurdities; The other, that is the Figurative do not so? Have we not reason enough without advising with Tradition about the matter, to reject the Literal sense and embrace the Spiritual? S. *Austin* certainly thought we had. For he gives us this direction in his Book *de Doctrinâ Christianâ*; and the first and fittest Text that he could choose to exemplifie his Rule, what think you is it? even the Cousin-German to that which you have made choice of. *Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, &c.* Here saith he, the Letter seems to command impiety. *Figura est ergo.* Therefore it is a Figure commanding to feed devoutly, upon the Passion of our Lord, and to lay up in our memory that Christ was crucified for us.

Uncle. These particulars peradventure would require a further discussion, and now I will take nothing but what is undeniable. As this is, to wit, That what points are in Controversie betwixt us and Protestants, we believe to have been delivered by Christ and his Apostles to our forefathers, and by them delivered from hand to hand to our Fathers, whom we know to have delivered them for such to us, and to have received and believed them for such themselves.

Certainly though Ink and Paper cannot blush, yet I dare say you were fain to rub your forehead over and over before you committed this to Writing. Say what you list, for my part I am so far from believing you, that I verily believe you do not believe your selves, when you pretend that you believe those points of your Doctrin which are in controversie, to have been delivered to your Forefathers by Christ and his Apostles. Is it possible that any sober man who has read the New Testament, should believe that Christ and his Apostles taught Christians, That it

was

was fit and lawful to deny the Laity the Sacramental Cup: That it was expedient and for the edification of the Church, that the Scripture should be read, and the publick worship of God perpetually celebrated in a language which they understand not, and to which for want of understanding, (unless S. *Paul* deceive us) they cannot say *Amen:* Or is it reasonable you should desire us to believe you, when your own Men, your own Champions, your own Councils confess the contrary?

Does not the Council of *Constance* acknowledg plainly, That the custom which they ratified, was contrary to Christs institution, and the custom of the Primitive Church? and how then was it taught by Christ and his Apostles?

Do not *Cajetan* and *Lyranus* confess ingenuously, that it follows evidently from S. *Paul*, that it is more for edification, that the Liturgy of the Church should be in such a Language as the Assistants understand?

The like Confession we have from others concerning Purgatory and Indulgences.

Others acknowledg the Apostles never taught Invocation of Saints.

Rhenanus says as much touching Auricular Confession.

It is evident from *Peter Lombard* that the Doctrin of Transubstantiation was not a point of Faith in his time.

From *Pius Mirandula* that the Infallibility of the Church was no Article, much less a foundation of Faith in his time.

Bellarmine acknowledges that the Saints enjoying the Vision of God before the day of judgment was no Article of Faith in the time of Pope *John* the XXII.

But as the Proverb is, when Thieves fall out, true men recover their goods: so how small and heartless the reverence of the Church of *Rome* is to ancient Tradition, cannot be more plainly discovered, than by the Quarrels which her Champions have amongst themselves, especially about the Immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin.

The Patrons of the Negative opinion, *Cajetan*, *Bannes*, *Bandellus* and *Canus*, alledg for it, First an whole army of Scriptures, Councils and Fathers, agreeing unanimously in this Doctrin, That only Christ was free from sin. Then, an innumerous multitude of Fathers expresly affirming the very point in question, not contradicted by any of their Contemporaries, or Predecessors, or indeed of their Successors for many ages.

All the Holy Fathers agree in this, that the Virgin *Mary* was conceived in Original sin. So * *Bannes.*

* In part primum q. 1. Art. 8. Dub. 5.

Cajetan brings for it fifteen Fathers in his judgment irrefragable, others produce two hundred, *Bandellus* almost three hundred. Thus † *Salmeron.*

† Disp. 51. in Ep. ad Rom.

That all the Holy Fathers who have fallen upon the mention of this matter, with one mouth affirm, that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in Original sin. So ‖ *Canus.*

‖ Lib. VII. loc. cap. 1. cap. 3. n. 9.

And after,——That the contrary Doctrin has neither Scripture nor Tradition for it. For (saith he) no Traditions can be derived unto us but by the Bishops and Holy Fathers, the Successors of the Apostles, and it is certain that those ancient writers received it not from their predecessors.

Now against this stream of ancient Writers, *when* the contrary new Doctrin came in, and how it prevailed, it will be worth the considering.

The First that set it abroach was *Richardus de Sancto Victore*, as his country-man * *Johannes Major* testifies of him. ——*He was expresly the first that held the* Virgin Mary *free from Original sin*, ——*or he was the first that expresly held so.* So after upon this false ground, which had already taken deep root in the heart of Christians, That it was impossible to give too much honour to her that was the Mother of the Saviour of the World; like an ill weed it grew and spread apace. So that in the Council of † *Basil*, (which *Binius* tells us was reprobated but in part, to wit, in the point of the Authority of Councils, and in the deposition of *Eugenius* the Pope) it was defined and declared, to be Holy Doctrin, and consonant to the worship of the Church,

* *Omnium expresse primus Christiferam virginem originalis noxæ expertem tenuit.* ——*De gestis Scotorum.* III. 12.

† Sess XXXVI.

Church, to the Catholick Faith, to right Reason and the Holy Scripture, and to be approved, held and embraced by all Catholicks: and that it should be lawful for no man for the time to come to preach or teach the contrary. The custom also of keeping the Feast of her Holy Conception, which before was but particular to the *Roman* and some other Churches, and it seems somewhat neglected, was then renewed and made Universal; and commanded to be celebrated — *sub nomine Conceptionis* — *under the name of the Conception.* *Binius* in a Marginal note tells us indeed, That they celebrate not this Feast in the Church of *Rome*, by virtue of this Renovation, — *cum esset Conciliabulum* — being this was the act not of a Council, but of a Conventicle, yet he himself in his Index, stiles it the Oecomenical Council of *Basil*, and tells that it was reprobated only in two points, of which this is none. Now whom shall we believe, *Binius* in his Margin, or *Binius* in his Index?

Yet in after-times Pope *Sixtus* IV. and *Pius* V. thought not this Decree so binding, but that they might and did again put life into the condemned opinion, giving liberty by their constitutions to all men to hold and maintain either part, either that the Blessed Virgin was conceived with Original sin or was not. Which Constitution of *Sixtus* IV. The * Council of *Trent* renewed and confirmed. * Sess. V.

But the wheel again turning, and the Negative opinion prevailing, The Affirmative was banisht, first by a Decree of *Paul* V. from all publick Sermons, Lectures, Conclusions, and all publick Acts whatsoever: and since by another Decree of *Gregory* XV. from all private Writings, and private Conferences.

But yet all this contents not the University of *Paris*. They, as *Salmeron* tells us, admit none to the Degree of Doctor of Divinity, unless they have first bound themselves by solemn Oath to maintain the Immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin.

Now I beseech you Mr. *R*—— consider your courses with some indifference.

First,

Firſt, You take Authority upon you, againſt the univerſal, conſtant, unoppoſed Tradition of the Church for many ages: to ſet up as a rival, a new upſtart yeſterdays invention: and to give all men liberty to hold which they pleaſe. So Pope *Sixtus* IV. The Council of *Trent*, and *Pius* V. that is, you make it lawful to hold the ancient Faith, or not to hold it, nay to hold the contrary. This is high preſumption. But you ſtay not here; For,

Secondly, The ancient Doctrin you cloyſter and hook up within the narrow, cloſe and dark rooms of the thoughts and brains of the defenders of it, forbidding them upon pain of damnation ſo much as to whiſper it in their private diſcourſes and writings: and in the mean time the New Doctrin you ſet at full liberty, and give leave, nay countenance and encouragement to all men to employ their time and wits and tongues and pens, in the maintenance and propagation of it. Thus *Paul* V. and *Gregory* XV. Yet this is not all; For,

Thirdly, You bind men by Oaths to defend the new opinion, and to oppoſe the ancient. So the Univerſity of *Paris*. Yet ſtill you proceed further; For,

Fourthly, By your General Councils confirmed by your Popes, you have declared and defined, that this new invention is agreeable, and conſequently that the ancient Doctrin is repugnant to the Catholick Faith, to Reaſon, to the Holy Scripture. So the Council of *Baſil*.

Theſe things I entreat you weigh well in your Conſideration, and put not into the Scale above a juſt allowance, not above three grains of partiality, and then tell me whether you can with reaſon or with modeſty ſuppoſe or deſire that we ſhould believe, or think that you believe, that all the points of Doctrin which you conteſt againſt us, were delivered at firſt by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and have ever ſince by the Succeſſion of Biſhops and Paſtors been preſerved inviolate and propagated unto you.

The Patrons I confeſs of this new Invention ſet not much by the Decree of the Council of *Baſil* for it, but plead very hard for a full and final definition of it from the Sea Apoſtolick

Apostolick: and finding the conspiring opposition of the ancient Fathers to be the main impediment of their purpose, it is strange to see how confidently they ride over them.

First, Says * *Salmeron* in the place forecited, *they press us with multitude of Doctors; of whom we must not say that they err in a matter of such moment.*

† Disp 51. in Epist. ad Rom.

We answer, says he, out of † *S.* Austin *and the Doctrin of S.* Thomas: *That the argument drawn from Authority is weak. Then to that multitude of Doctors we oppose another multitude.*

‖ De moribus Eccleſia. lib 1. cap. 2.

Thirdly, We object to the contrary the efficacy of reasons, which are more excellent than any Authority.

Some of them reckon two hundred Fathers, other as Bandellus *almost three hundred,* Cajetan *fifteen, but those as he says irrefragable. But as a wise Shepheard said* ——pauperis est numerare pecus. *Some of those whom they produce are of an exolete Authority, and scarce worthy of memory.*

Lastly, Against this objected multitude we answer with the word of God. * Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil. Neither shalt thou in judgment yield to the sentence of many to depart from the truth. *For when the* Donatists *gloried in the multitude of their Authors, S.* Austin *answered* it was a sign of a cause destitute of truth, to rely only upon the Authority of many men which may err.

* Exod. 23 2.

It falls out sometimes also that from some one Doctor, especially if he be famous, proceeds a multitude of followers of his Opinion, and some, taken with an humble and pious fear, choose rather to follow the Opinion of another against their mind, than to bring out of their own wit any thing new, last they should so bring any new thing into the Church. Whose humility as it is to be praised, so the confidence of others is not to be condemned, who for the love of truth fear not to bring in better things. Thus S. Hierome *in his Sermon of the Assumption, if it be his, fears to affirm that the Virgin* Mary *is assumed into Heaven, and thinks it rather to be piously desired, than rashly defined. But* * *S.* Austin *more happily dared to affirm it, and settle it with many argument, by which adventure this the Church hath gained,*

* In the Margint here he says, *The Doctrin of S.* Austin *alone hath brought into the Church the Worship of the blessed Virgins Assumption.*

gained, that perſwaded by his reaſons ſhe hath believed it, and celebrates it in her worſhip.

But they fetch their arguments from the Antiquity of the Doctors, to which always greater honour was given than to Novelties. But I anſwer, old men are praiſers of ancient times, but we affirm, the younger the Doctors are, the more perſpicacious. Moreover we ſay that although they were ancient yet they were men, and themſelves held under the darkneſs of Original ſin and might err. But go to, who are theſe Ancients? are they Apoſtles? are they Ambroſe *or* Hierom, *or* Auſtin? *but none of them diſcuſs'd this Controverſie on purpoſe.*

Chryſoſtom *is oppoſed in his Commentary on S.* Matthew, *where he ſaith* though Chriſt were not a ſinner, yet he has humane Nature from a ſinner. *Underſtand* (ſays *Salmeron*) *from her who of her ſelf, and according to the condition of nature was a ſinner.* Thomas *ſays that* Chryſoſtom *ſpeaks exorbitantly, for he conſtitutes the* Virgin *under actual ſin. Or that the Commentaries which go up and down under his name are not his. Or that theſe paſſages are adjectitious. Or if they be indeed his, with the good leave and favour of ſo great a man, they are to be rejected. Neither ought any man to marvel that he &* Bernard, *and* Thomas, *and* Bonaventure, *and* Alexander *of* Ales, *and* Albert, *and* Durand, *and* Egidius; *and Laſtly, The greater part followed that opinion: both becauſe they were men, and becauſe in progreſs of time, new myſteries are revealed which before were unknown. — For as holineſs of life purgeth no man from ſin, ſo it frees no man from danger of error. — Every age finds out ſome verities proper to it ſelf, which the former ages were ignorant of,* —and there in the Margin, *Every age hath its peculiar divine revelations.*

Thus far *Salmeron*, by whom we may ſee, That *Proteſtants* are not the only men who ſay that the Fathers may err: but that *Roman Catholicks* too, can and dare valiantly break through, and tread under their feet (though perhaps with cap in hand, and ſome ſhew of reverence) and even ride over whole bands of Fathers when they ſtand in their way.

Another

Another great *Achilles* for the same opinion is one *Joannes Baptista Poza*, a Jesuite, and Professor of Divinity at *Complutum*: He in his fourth Book of his *Elucidarium Deiparæ*, pleads very earnestly to have it defined, and labours very lustily to remove all exceptions to the contrary, but above all those many ones, —That there is no Tradition for it, That the stream of Ancient Tradition is against, and therefore well and worthily may it be condemned for an Heresie: but to be Canonized among the Articles of Faith, it can with no reason expect.

To the Second exception he brings two answers which *Salmeron* it seems forgot, in the prosecution whereof he hath many excellent passages, which I have thought good to cull out of him to evidence the wonderful reverence, and constant regard of the present Church of *Rome*, to the Tradition of the Ancient.

The first, That it is possible the Writings of the Fathers out of which these Testimonies against the *Immaculate conception* are taken, may be corrupted: But to shew it probable they are so in these places, he speaks not one word of sense, nor so much as any colourable reason, unless this may pass for one (as perhaps it may where reasons are scarce.) No proposition, which contradicts the common judgment of the Fathers can be probable, ; * But it is *de fide* that our opinion is probable, for the Council of *Trent* hath made it so by giving liberty to all to hold it. Therefore without doubt we must hold, that it is not (whatsoever it seems) against the common judgment of the Fathers. This argument saith he doth most illustriously convince the followers of the contrary opinion: that they ought not to dare affirm hereafter, that their opinion flowes from the common judgment and writings of the ancient Doctors.

* I should rather subsume, but this does so. Therefore not probable.

His second answer is, That whereas *Bandillus* and *Cajetan*, &c. produce general sayings of *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Athanasius*, *Theophilus Alexandrinus*, *Greg. Nyssen*, *Basil*, *Greg. Naz.* *Cyprian*, *Hierom*, *Fulgentius*, and in a manner of all the ancient Fathers, exempting Christ alone from, and consequently concluding the Virgin *Mary* under Original

sin, which Argument must needs conclude if the Virgin *Mary* be not Christ. His answer I say is, These Testimonies have little or no strength: for did they conclude, we must then (let us in Gods name) say that the Virgin *Mary* committed also many venial sins: For the Scriptures, Fathers and Councils set forth in propositions as Universal. That there is no man but Christ who is not often defiled at least with smaller sins, and who may not justly say that Petition of our Lords Prayer, *Demitte nobis debita nostra.*

An answer I confess as fit as a Napkin to stop the mouths of his domestick adversaries, though no way fit to satisfie their reason. But this man little thought there were *Protestants* in the world as well as *Dominicans*, who will not much be troubled by thieves falling out, to recover more of their goods than they expected, and to see a prevaricating Jesuit, instead of stopping one breach in their ruinous cause, to make two. For whereas this man argues from the destruction of the Consequent to the destruction of the Antecedent thus: If these testimonies were good and concluding, then the Virgin *Mary* should have been guilty not only of Original but also of actual sin, But the Consequent is false and blasphemous: Therefore the Antecedent is not true. They on the others side argue, and sure with much more reason, and much more conformity to the Ancient Tradition: From the Assertion of the Antecedent to the Assertion of the Consequent, thus: If these testimonies be good and concluding, then the Blessed Virgin was guilty both of Original sin and Actual; but the Testimonies are good and concluding; therefore she was guilty even of actual sins, and therefore much more of Original.

His Third Answer is, That their Church hath, or may define many other things against which (if their works be not depraved) there lies a greater consent of Fathers, than against the Immaculate Conception, and therefore why not this?

The Instances he gives are four.

1. That the Blessed Virgin committed no actual sin.

2. That

2. That the Angels were not created before the visible world.

3. That Angels are Incorporeal.

4. That the Souls of Saints departed are made happy by the Vision of God before the day of Judgment.

Against the first Opinion he alledges direct places out of *Origen*, which he says admit no exposition; though *Pamelius* upon *Tertullian*, and *Sixtus Senensis* labour in vain to put a good sense on them. — Out of *Euthymius* and *Theophylact*: Out of S. *Chrysostom* divers pregnant testimonies, and S. *Thomas* his confession touching one of them, out of the Author of the Questions of the New and Old Testament in S. *Austin* cap. 75. Out of S. *Hilary* upon *Psa.* 118. which words yet says he *Tolet* has drawn to a good construction: yet so much difficulty still remains in them. — Out of *Tertullian de carne Christi* cap. 7. which he tells us will not be salved by *Pamelius* his gloss. — Out of *Athanasius*, out of *Irenæus* III. 18. out of S. *Austin* lib. 2. *de Symbolo ad Catech.* cap. 5. Whose words yet, because they admit, says *Poza*, some exposition, I thought fit to suppress, though some think they are very hard to be avoided. Out of *Greg. Nyss.* — out of S. *Cyprian* in his Sermon on the Passion: Whose words, says he; though they may by some means be eluded, yet will always be very difficult if we examin the Antecedents and Consequents: out of *Anselm*, *Rich. de* S. *Victor*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Andrew* of *Hierusalem*, and S. *Bede* and then tells us there are many other Testimonies much resembling these: and besides many Fathers and Texts of Scripture, which exempt Christ only from actual sin, and lastly, many suspicious sayings against her Immunity in them, who use to say that at the Angels Annunciation she was cleansed and purged and expiated from all faults committed by her freewill, which saith he, though *Canisius* and others explicate in a pious sense, yet at least they shew, that either those alledged against the Imaculate conception are as favourable to be expounded: Or we must say, that a verity may be defined by the See Apostolick against the judgment of some Fathers.

From these things, says he, is drawn an unanswerable reason, That for the defining the purity of the conception, nothing now is wanting. For seeing, notwithstanding more and more convincing testimonies of Fathers who either did, or did seem to ascribe actual sin to the Blessed Virgin; notwithstanding the Universal sayings of Scripture and Councils bringing all, except Christ, under sin: Lastly, notwithstanding the silence of the Scriptures and Councils touching her Immunity from actual sin, seeing notwithstanding all this the Council of *Trent* hath either decreed, or hath confirmed, it being before decreed by the consent of the faithful, that the Blessed Virgin never was guilty of any voluntary, no not the least sin: It follows certainly that the Apostolick See, hath as good nay better ground, to enrol amongst her Articles the Virgins Immaculate conception: The reason is clear, for neither are there so many nor so evident sentences of Fathers which impute any fault or blemish to the Conception of the Mother of God, as there are in appearance to charge her with actual offences. Neither are there fewer Universal propositions in Scripture, by which it may be proved that only Jesus was free from actual sin, and therefore that the Virgin *Mary* fell into it. Neither can there at this time be desired a greater consent of the faithful, nor a more ardent desire than there now is, that this verity should be defined, and that the contrary Opinion should be Anathematized for Erroneous and Heretical. The words of the Council of *Trent* on which this reason is grounded are these.

Sess. VI. c. 23. de Justific.

If any man say, That a man all his life long may avoid all, even venial sins, unless by special priviledge from God, as the Church holds of the Blessed Virgin, let him be Anathema. But if the consent of the Church hath prevailed against more clear Testimonies of ancient Fathers, even for that which is favoured with no express authority of Scriptures or Councils: And if the Council of *Trent* upon this consent of the faithful, hath either defined this Immunity of the Virgin, from all actual sin, or declared it to be defined: Who then

can

can deny but that the Church hath immediate power to define among the Articles of Faith, the pious Opinion of the Immaculate Conception?

His ſecond Example by which he declares the power of their Church to define Articles againſt a multitude of Fathers (and conſequently not only without but againſt Tradition) is the opinion that Angels were not created before the Corporeal world was created: which ſaith he is, or may be defined, though there were more Teſtimonies of Fathers againſt it, than againſt the Immaculate Conception. So he ſays in the Argument of his Fifth Chapter, and in the end of the ſame Chapter: The Council of *Lateran* hath defined this againſt the expreſs judgment of twenty Fathers, of which *Nazianzen*, *Baſil*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Cyrill*, *Hierom*, *Ambroſe*, and *Hillary* are part.

His third Example to the ſame purpoſe, is the opinion that Angels are Incorporeal: againſt which ſaith he, in the Argument of his ſixth Chapter: there are more Teſtimonies of the Fathers, than againſt the Immaculate Conception, and yet it is, or at leaſt may be defined by the Church, and in the end of the Chapter, I have for this Opinion cited twenty three Fathers, which as moſt men think is now condemned in the * *Lateran* Council, or at leaſt as † *Suarez* proves, is to be rejected as manifeſtly temerarious.

*Firm de ſummâ Trinitate.
† De Angelis. lib. 6.

His fourth and laſt Example to the ſame purpoſe is, The Opinion that the Souls of Saints departed enjoy the Viſion of God before the Reſurrection. Againſt which he tells us in the firſt place was the Judgment of Pope *John* XXI. though not as a Pope but as a private Doctor. Then he muſters up againſt it a great multitude of *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers, touching which he ſays—— All theſe Teſtimonies when * *Vaſquez* has related, at length he † anſwers that they might be ſo explained as to ſay nothing againſt the true and Catholick Doctrin. Yet if they could not be ſo explained, their Authority ought not to hinder us from embracing that which the Church

* 1. 2. D. 29. cap. 1.
† cap. 3.

Church hath defined. The same argument I make (says *Poza*) The Fathers and ancient Doctors which are objected against the pious opinion of the Conception of the Virgin, may be commodiously explicated, or at least so handled that they shall not hurt: Notwithstanding though they cannot be explicated, some of them, that their Testimonies ought not to hinder, but that the Sea Apostolick may define the Blessed Virgins preservation from Original sin. In fine, for the close of this Argument he adds, *Nolo per plura.* ——I will not run through more Examples: These that I have reckoned are sufficient, and admonishes learned men to bring together other like proofs, whereby they may promote the desired Determination.

FINIS.